

Copyright
by
Amy Kathleen Lather
2012

**The Report Committee for Amy Kathleen Lather
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

Cooperative Commemoration: Simonides on the Persian Wars

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

(Deborah Beck)

(Paula Perlman)

Cooperative Commemoration: Simonides on the Persian Wars

by

Amy Kathleen Lather, BA

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2012

Abstract

Cooperative Commemoration: Simonides on the Persian Wars

Amy Kathleen Lather, MA

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Deborah Beck

The name ‘Simonides’ has long been associated with the Persian Wars. More specifically, Simonides is famous in large part because of his commemoration of the Persian War dead in the form of epigrams. The purpose of this paper is to investigate a set of four of the most famous and most distinctively ‘Simonidean’ poems to the end of delineating their stylistic deviations from conventional epitaphic speech. This paper argues that the specific ways in which Simonides departs from the conventions of epigrammatic language serve to convey a distinctively democratic *ethos*. This *ethos* is clear in that Simonides’ epigrams privilege the mass efforts of the collective, and do not praise any particular individuals over another. Moreover, that these poems do not include the sort of identifying details that we would normally expect to find in epigrams anticipates a readership that is uniformly knowledgeable about the events of the Persian Wars. This represents another facet of the egalitarian *ethos* evident in this group of epigrams, as Simonides treats his readers as *equally* aware of the events of the Persian Wars. Thus, Simonides assumes a unified, panhellenic identity that characterizes both the subjects of his poems as well as his readers: they are all part of the same entity that defeated the Persians. Simultaneously, however, Simonides, or at the very least, the Simonidean name, achieves his own *kleos* as an individual poet through his distinctive commemorations of the Persian War dead. With these poems comes the emergence of a Simonidean poetic persona that renders the poet’s voice unique because of the way in which Simonides diverges from epigrammatic convention. The allotment of immortal *kleos* both to the anonymous, undifferentiated masses of Persian War dead and to the name ‘Simonides’ reflects two distinctive ideologies, the latter archaic and the former classical. My reading of these epigrams thus demonstrates how the commemoration of the Persian Wars is poised between two different eras and two different ideologies.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: The genre of archaic and classical epigram.....	13
Chapter Two: The epigrams--text and transmission.....	22
Chapter Three: Simonidean style.....	33
Chapter Four: Conclusions: the emergence of different types of <i>kleos</i>	63
Bibliography.....	69

Introduction

Epigrams exist to ensure the remembrance of a particular person or persons. The creation of an inscribed monument on behalf of the dead is one way to secure the continued presence of the deceased in the world of the living. The grave monument functions as a physical reminder of the deceased and marks the place where they are interred.¹ For the Greek epigrams of the archaic and classical periods, remembrance of the dead is rendered in the form of *kleos*: fame or renown.² The name and adequate identification of the dead is of obvious importance to the preservation of the particular person's memory, and this is information that the inscribed epigram needs to convey. Without clear identification of the deceased, the commemorative force of the epigram and the tomb or marker on which it is inscribed is diminished, because it is not clear whom the grave marker represents. Thus the epigram served two purposes: on the one hand, it designates the monument as indicative of the presence of a person's remains. In addition, it signifies that the monument belongs to a particular someone. Most importantly, the epigram is the necessary ingredient for the continued existence of the dead person's *kleos*.³

The epigram continues to function as a means to convey the *kleos* of the dead until the Hellenistic period, when it is detached from its funerary setting and becomes a

¹ This is what Sourvinou-Inwood terms the "indexical" function of the monument, that is, as indicative of the precise location where the deceased is interred. In the case of collective burial, such as a family burial space, an individual *sema* could have marked out an individual from the collective space (1995) 144-145.

² Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 118, 129; Svenbro (1988) 12-13.

³ See Day (2010) "Reading epigrams, then, generated *kleos*, commemorative poetic speech" (44). See also Svenbro (1993) 62, 164 on inscriptions as "machines" for *kleos*.

literary genre in its own right.⁴ The Persian Wars serve to mark out the archaic epigram from the classical, and it is on this intermediary period that I shall be concentrating. My study is devoted to poems 92D, 91D, 90D, and 121D,⁵ as they represent the epigrams on the Persian Wars with the strongest claims to authenticity. I seek to determine the ways in which the Persian Wars and Simonides' commemoration of its casualties represent a transitory phase between the archaic and classical styles of commemoration. My basic claim is that Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars contain stylistic departures from the conventions of early epigram and that these variations on the epigrammatic style can be characterized in terms of the *absence* of identifying details therein.⁶ Further, my purpose is to show that the ways in which Simonides departs from epigrammatic convention enable him to convey a distinctly democratic *ethos* in commemorating the Persian War dead.

The presence (or lack thereof) of a physical object in association with the poem distinguishes early epigrams of the archaic and classical periods from those of the Hellenistic era.⁷ Epigrams are fundamentally inscriptional artifacts, evident in the term ἐπιγράμματα itself, as something “written upon”.⁸ This testifies to the close relationship that existed between the text of an epigram and its object, one that was especially important during the archaic period. Further, archaic epigrams work in connection both

⁴ Gutzwiller (1995) 7-11.

⁵ The numbering used here is from the third edition of Diehls' *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (1952).

⁶ The corpus of epigrams to which I refer here are those collected by Hansen in the 3rd edition of the *CEG*. The total number of sepulchral epitaphs collected, from the 7th to 5th centuries, is 178.

⁷ For the sake of convenience, I will, at times, refer to archaic and classical epigrams together as “early” epigrams, following the terminology of Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010).

⁸ See also Bruss (2005) 2-5, Gutzwiller (1998) 1-3.

to funerary objects *and* to dedicatory ritual in this period. The presence of a physical monument provided a place for rituals to take place and for ritual offerings and attention to be devoted.⁹ That a text's relationship to an object is a criterion for distinguishing phases in the genre of epigram illustrates the fundamentality of the grave object for early epigrams, as this shows the necessity of a grave object for the style of early epigrams.

Epigrams were thus an essential part of the grave setting. Moreover, as the epigrams in my study are for *polyandreia*, that is, for groups of men, there would have been multiple components involved at the gravesite, not just a single tomb and inscription. Unfortunately, the precise makeup and appearance of these types of monuments is unclear, unlike grave monuments for individuals, for which there is more evidence. The material remains of *polyandreia* that we do have suggests that the epigram, like those for private individuals, was inscribed at the base of a *stele*, but the other items that would have accompanied it are not certain. Clairmont proposes that separate *stelai*, inscribed with the names of the dead, would have formed another part of these gravesites.¹⁰ However, the extent to which inscribed casualty lists supplemented the commemoration of war dead is entirely uncertain. Nevertheless it will be important to keep in mind that Simonides' poems would have formed part of the larger commemorative structure of the burial site, which may or may not have included casualty lists.

⁹ This kind of attention is implicit in the term *agalma* as it is applied to the grave monument, as this term alludes to the rituals that would accompany grave objects. On this see Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 141, cf. also Day (2010) 85-106.

¹⁰ (1983) 62.

However, Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars are much less object-dependent than other early sepulchral epitaphs. That the language of Simonides' epigrams on the wars pays no attention to its physical setting de-emphasizes the appearance and physical impressiveness of the grave marker. By concentrating the reader's attention solely on the message of the epigram without referencing anything else at the site of the grave, these epigrams focus the reader's attention on the commemoration of the war dead rather than on the appearance of the grave marker.¹¹ In this respect alone we see a clear departure from the approach of archaic epitaph, in which the physical impressiveness and appearance of the monument played as much of a role as the epigram in furthering the dead man's *kleos*.¹² This dual role, of the monument's appearance and the epigram's language, accounts for the feature of the archaic epitaph that frequently, if not always, makes reference to its monument by means of a deictic expression.¹³ That Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars makes no such references indicates that the epigram alone is meant to serve as sufficient commemoration, and to preserve the *kleos* of the deceased without the aid of an elaborate funerary monument. The function of the grave monument is reduced to the role of vehicle for the epigram, and not a crucial part of the commemoration.

¹¹ As the poems in my study are for *polyandreia*, there would likely have been several parts to the grave marker, comprised of a base with *stele* attached on top. The epitaph would probably have been inscribed at the base. Unfortunately, it is unclear what these structures would have looked like in their finished state. Clairmont (1983) ventures that "rows of stelai upon which the casualty lists were inscribed was probably a quite common type of state memorial" (62); however, he admits that funerary monuments outside of Athens may have been quite different (46). Thus we cannot safely presume the presence of casualty lists to supplement the poems discussed here.

¹² Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 118-119.

¹³ Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 386; Day (2010) 46.

The lack of reference to a monument has the added effect of downplaying the role of the tomb's commissioner. As *polyandreia* for war dead, these texts and their monuments were commissioned at the expense of a state or *polis*, and not on the dime of a private individual or family. Although Simonides obliquely references the ethnic origins of the deceased,¹⁴ he never in these epigrams makes explicit the entity responsible for the epigram's commission. It is only from later sources like Herodotus that we get any information as to the circumstances of the epigram's creation, if we get that information at all. I will contend that this particular feature of his epigrams (i.e. his exclusion of the name of a dedicator or dedicator[s]) is another indication of a democratic *ethos* and is one that works in tandem with Simonides' lack of reference to the grave monument. By not naming a dedicatory figure within the text of the epigram, Simonides maintains the commemorative focus on the deceased and more specifically, on the *collective* deceased. That the language of the epigrams includes only the anonymous collective makes clear that their purpose is to preserve the *kleos* of the fallen soldiers alone, and not that of the entity commissioning the poem.¹⁵ In this way we can see how the epigrams consciously preserve *kleos* for the war dead and do not allot it to living persons.

In addition to the marked absence of an object or physical setting, there is a distinct lack of names and other features that would serve to identify the dead in

¹⁴ For example, 92D references the Spartans, Λακεδαιμονίοις, and 90D similarly mentions Corinth, Φορὶνθο.

¹⁵ The dedicator of an object, particularly in dedicatory, as opposed to sepulchral epigrams, emerges as a figure equal in importance to the dedicated object itself, and the object becomes a means of furthering the *kleos* of the dedicator as much as the devotee of the object. CEG 344 provides a good example of this belief and explicitly articulates the view that divides the *kleos* between the dedicator and dedicatee. For more on this see Day (2010) 183-187.

Simonides' Persian War epigrams. The absence of this information helps Simonides to characterize his subjects as anonymous entities, distinctive only by being part of a specific group. Without the contextualization provided by the literary tradition in which the poems were preserved, it would be unclear to which events and to which people these epigrams refer. This characteristic appears to be at odds with Simonides' commemorative task, as the language of his poems does not itself convey the information necessary in order to identify the dead and thus perpetuate their *kleos*.

The most important piece of information that is conspicuously absent from these epigrams is any mention of the victory achieved against the Persians as a result of these battles. This is a crucial piece of the warriors' identity that needs to be supplied by the reader. The language of the epigrams commemorates the dead solely as being part of a collective, while it is left to the reader to ascertain that the Greeks were victorious *because of* their fighting as a cooperative force. This reliance on a reader's knowledge represents another significant departure from generic conventions, and more importantly, raises questions about the commemorative function of these epigrams: how do they function commemoratively if the epigram does not even explicitly identify its subjects? That Simonides excludes such information suggests that his particular commemoration of the war dead is of a different sort than that commemoration effected by other early epigrams. And it is this manner of commemoration that distinguishes Simonides, or the name "Simonides" as a distinct poetic persona.

This paper has several aims. First, I will delineate the ways in which Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars are unlike other early epigrams. These peculiarities of the

poems can be characterized in terms of the *lack* of information that they convey. They do not reference their physical surroundings, nor does the language of the poems render explicit the identity of its subjects, and finally, they do not mention the circumstances of the epigram's creation (e.g. what battle it commemorates, who commissioned it, etc.). On my view, these features not only represent marked departures from the conventions of epigram, but also constitute a distinctive Simonidean style of epigram. The effect of this style is that the cohesiveness of the soldiers is emphasized. That Simonides does not give specific clues as to the deceased's identity draws attention to the anonymity that results due to their dying *en masse*. However, Simonides also attempts to forge a *new* identity for his subjects by singling out the *collective* force as the harbinger of victory for Greece.¹⁶

Unlike epigrams for private individuals, for whom no other written record may exist, these poems and their contents are discussed elsewhere in the literary record, which enables us to better determine the context for the poems not evident in the text of the epigrams themselves. The epigrams' historical relevance sets them apart because they refer to events that affected a huge spread of people, and thus, to events with which a large number of people would have been familiar. Whereas private epigrams have to supply information about an individual such that a stranger, someone who did not know the deceased, can understand to whom the text refers, Simonides may have been able to assume that a greater proportion of his readers would be familiar with the events and

¹⁶ This is an *ethos* that finds its full expression in the Athenian *epitaphios logos* only a few decades after the Persian Wars. On this see Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 192-3; Loraux (1981) 75.

people he commemorates, so that he does not have to name them himself.¹⁷ I will argue that these epigrams require a degree of historical knowledge in order to be understood, and that this demonstrates that Simonides anticipates a different degree of knowledge from his audience than do other early epigrams, which treat their readers as wholly unfamiliar with the subjects of their poems. Simonides' expectation of a *uniformly* knowledgeable audience who would be able to comprehend his poems represents another facet of a democratic *ethos*.

The distinctiveness of Simonidean style, with its peculiar ability to convey this new, democratic ideal *contra* the conventions of earlier epigram, forms the basis for the *kleos* that is allotted to "Simonides" the poet. That Simonides' name is attributed to these epigrams in itself constitutes a divergence from epigrammatic convention. I argue that Simonides became famous as *the* poet of the Persian Wars precisely because of the unique capacity of his epigrams to commemorate the Persian War dead in such a way as to include a panhellenic audience that does not privilege one set of readers over another. For Simonides' assumed reader represents another facet of the Simonidean democratic *ethos*: just as he treats the dead men of his epigrams as anonymous equals, so too are his readers treated as equals in that they are supposed to be equally familiar with the events of the wars. Readers are expected to have the same degree of knowledge about the wars, knowledge that is necessary in order to be able to fill in the blanks left in the epigram. Without such a reader, the epigrams would not be able to function commemoratively.

¹⁷ cf. Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (2010) 16-18. See Bowie (2010) 335-339 for a good summary of the features that characterize early sepulchral epigram, many of which will be discussed here.

That these epigrams persisted through time to be quoted by later authors, and that Simonides became famous for his work on the Persian Wars, indicates that this was an unproblematic expectation for his audience. That his poems did not include the sort of identifying information that we would normally expect to find in epigrams thus does not seem to have affected his commemorative purpose. What's more, this is a panhellenic spread of readers. Simonides composed on behalf of the dead from various parts of Greece, and his address to the poem's readers as "stranger" (ὁ ξένος) attests to the burial and commemoration of the dead in areas outside their native *poleis*. Even though the epigram's readers are construed as "strangers" in two of the epigrams, that they are still expected to recognize the subjects of the poem signifies that the task of commemorating the war dead was a panhellenic one, and not confined to the native territories of the deceased. Simonidean style, then, is constructed to suit an audience of equals as well as commemorate groups of equals.

The distinctiveness of this style, manifested in its conscious departures from the generic conventions of epigram, is part of the reason that these epigrams have been transmitted in the literary tradition. The recognition of a poetic persona in itself sets Simonides as a poet apart from other epigrammatists. That Simonides' name is transmitted along with these epigrams is highly unusual for the early phase of the genre, in which the epigrammatist was always anonymous, a convention that persisted up until the Hellenistic period.¹⁸ The final part of my argument claims that the name "Simonides" shares in the *kleos* that his epigrams confer upon their subjects. This persona is visible in

¹⁸ Gutzwiller (1998) 3.

the authority that the Simonidean name comes to have with respect to the historical truths of the Persian Wars. Later authors treat Simonides as a credible, historical source.

Plutarch, for one, cites Simonidean epigrams as counter-evidence to the accounts of Herodotus.¹⁹ However, the existence of a Simonidean persona makes difficult the task of determining the authenticity of epigrams that are attributed to him in later authors. As it was not the custom for epitaphs to bear the name of their composer, Simonides' name is attached to these epigrams exclusively in later writers, with Herodotus representing the earliest author to reference Simonides as an epigrammatist.

As a result of the literary aspect of the poems' transmission, none of the epigrams that I will study here are indubitably the work of the "real" Simonides.²⁰ This is unproblematic for my claims, however, since I am not attempting to demonstrate the veracity of an author who cites a poem as the work of Simonides. I am not interested in the "real", historical Simonides. Rather, I am interested in the formation of a poetic persona that is called "Simonides" or "Simonidean", and I will be claiming that there exists a unique Simonidean style to complement this persona. In the group of epigrams I study here, I will be setting out the stylistic similarities between the poem that suggest that these poems are, at the very least, attempts to recreate the same poetic persona, even if they are not all the work of the historical Simonides. For the sake of convenience, I will still refer to the author of these epigrams as Simonides without quotation marks

¹⁹ *De mal. Herod.* 870E-71C = ch. 39.

²⁰ Carolyn Higbie characterizes the corpus of "Simonidean" epigrams as follows, "The consensus today is that Simonides is the author of only one of all the Persian War epigrams attributed to him, that in honour of the seer Megistias" (2010:187).

throughout this paper; when I mean to refer specifically to the persona associated with his compositions I will use "Simonides" or Simonidean.

I will adhere to the following structure in addressing each of the claims set out above. In the first section, I will discuss archaic epigram as a genre and delineate several of its distinctive stylistic features. In the second section, I will demonstrate how the linguistic oddities of the epigrams contribute to the creation of a specifically democratic *ethos* and an identity for the deceased that characterizes them as part of a group. The third and final section discusses the implications of the particularly Simonidean style that I have presented in section two. What I shall argue is that the characterization of the dead that Simonides presents in these epigrams is symptomatic of a larger ideological framework for commemoration, one that is much more democratic than that of the archaic period. Moreover, this *ethos*, of privileging the collective force, becomes a source of Simonidean *kleos*. My aim is to show how the Persian Wars and its subsequent commemoration represent a transitory phase between the archaic and classical periods, manifested in the convergence of different ideals.

My work here seeks to supplement the great deal of new scholarship devoted to early epigram that has emerged in recent years. Within the past two years, two books have been published which are crucial to my study: Joseph Day's monograph on dedicatory epigram and the volume of essays edited by Baumbach, Petrovic, and

Petrovic.²¹ I will be referencing these works at length throughout this study, as these works represent important developments in the study of epigram. Joseph Day looks at epigram in the context of performance and re-performance, while the *BPP* volume gathers essays that take a variety of perspectives on epigram: historical, political, material, to name a few. To this volume I intend to add a fresh perspective in keeping with the general thesis of the collection, which seeks to emphasize the literary and artistic qualities of archaic and classical epigrams. I will do so first by identifying a distinctively Simonidean style, and then arguing for the political and ideological implications of the particular kind of commemoration that is observable in the poems on the Persian Wars.

²¹ Day, Joseph. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication*. Cambridge: 2010. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*. Baumbach, Manuel, Petrovic, Andrej, and Ivana Petrovic, eds. Cambridge: 2010. The latter volume will be referred to as *BPP* for convenience.

Chapter One: The genre of archaic and classical epigram

Epigram, as one of the oldest literary forms of Greek literature, is part of an established generic tradition for which formulaic or standard elements of the epigrammatic form can be discerned. In this section I will be focusing on several of these generic features. It is necessary to clarify that the tradition of epigrams to which I refer in this section are those termed as such by being metrical inscriptions on stone, as distinct from prose inscriptions. The features of epigram on which I will focus are: 1) the importance of names and naming for epigrams and commemoration; 2) the localization of the epigram to the site of the monument by means of deictics such as “this tomb” or “this place”; 3) related to 2), the epigram’s awareness of its dependence on its object, the monument, as manifested in the language of the poem itself. This is seen both in the epigram’s habit of referring to its monument by means of deictic expressions and in the genre’s omnipresent inclusion of relevant names (of commemorated and commemorator). The latter evidences one of epigram’s important functions, which is to label and explain the physical monument itself. This is with the aim of furthering the dead person’s *kleos* by clearly marking out the grave object as belonging to a particular person. This is conventionally achieved by explicitly naming the dead person within the text of the epigram.²² The grave marker, then, depends on the epigram for meaning, as the epigram labels the marker the monument *of* someone.

²² CEG 26 provides a good illustration, τόδ’ Ἀρχίο ’στι σῆμα ; καὶ δὲ λφῆς φίλῃς. See also CEG 13, 16, 34, 41, 60.

One of the most common appellations for the grave marker of the archaic and classical periods is *sema*, literally a “marker”.²³ This term encapsulates the indexical function of the monument, that is, as a way to designate the deceased in physical space. In whatever form the *sema* took (e.g. as a plain *stele*, or inscribed statue, etc.), it stood as a marker both of the place where the dead is buried *and* as a marker of their continued presence among the living. In addition, however, the gravestone has a further indexical role to play in that it signifies that the deceased named in the epigram is now to be identified among the dead.²⁴ Thus the presence of a monument marks a temporal as well as physical shift from life to death. As I will show in section III below, Simonides marks this transition in the language of his poems rather than by reference to the monument. He creates a new identity for the deceased that can exist *apart from* the monument itself. This identity consists in the soldiers’ contribution to Greece’s victory in the Persian Wars: the tangible manifestation of their *kleos* resides not in the monuments erected in their honor, but in the preservation of Greece to which their efforts were devoted.

For Simonides’ epigrams on the Persian Wars, the indexical function of the grave marker would have had a further dimension in that it would not only have designated where the soldiers were buried, but also where they had fought. Thucydides informs us (II.34.5) that it was customary for Greeks to inter the war dead where they had fallen, and the same custom is attributed in Herodotus (7.228.1). Therefore it is likely that these poems, if they are authentically Simonidean, had a place on the battlefields themselves.

²³ e.g. *CEG* 40, τόπικλέος παιδὸς Δαμα|σιστράτο ἐνθάδε σῆμα; *CEG* 26, τόδ’ Ἀρχίο ’στι σῆμα; *CEG* 28, στῆθι | καὶ οἴκτιρον ; σῆμα Θράσονος.

²⁴ Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 117-119.

This makes it more striking that Simonides does not in these epigrams more explicitly incorporate the physical setting in a manner consistent with early epigrammatic language.

The frequency with which early epigrams reference and clearly demarcate the monument as the possession of a particular person is a reflection of the role of the reader in the commemoration of the deceased. *CEG* 26 nicely illustrates the typical archaic reference both to monument and to the deceased, τόδ' Ἀρχίο 'στι σῆμα · καὶ δελφεῖς φίλες.²⁵ The perpetuation of the soldiers' *kleos* in these epigrams depends, like all early epigrams, on the existence of readers for the epigrams. Epigrams exist not only to identify the dead person, but also to identify them *to* someone. The placement of an inscribed monument along main roads, a practice that becomes increasingly popular in the classical period,²⁶ ensured a continual presence of readers for the grave marker.²⁷ Also typical of epigram, particularly classical epigram, is an address to the reader or passer-by, usually accompanied by an invocation to stop and read.²⁸ The epigram helps to activate a response to the monument, first by explaining the existence of the marker and whom it commemorates, and second by entreating reading, either explicitly (in language that makes an address to its readers), or implicitly, by the inscription of the epitaph such that the reader's eye can easily follow and understand its speech.²⁹

²⁵ See also *CEG* 46 for this formula, σῆμα φί[λ]ο παιδὸς τόδε ἰδὲν Δι[όδωρος] ἔθηκεν; "Look, this is the tomb that Diodorus dedicated for his beloved child." Other examples include, but are not limited to, *CEG* 470, 40, and 111.

²⁶ Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 92-93.

²⁷ Day (2010) 28.

²⁸ Tueller (2010) 42-60; Vestrheim (2010) 61-74.

²⁹ Day (2010) 48-59.

The epigram and monument do not commemorate the deceased on their own, but need the participation of an outside reader in order to enable the dead person's remembrance. This may involve such activities as reading the inscribed epigram, admiring the physical structure of the monument, or leaving offerings for the deceased.³⁰ The epigram thus depends on its inscription on a grave marker in order to ensure access to readers. Meanwhile, the deceased depends on the grave object (with accompanying inscription) to maintain contact with readers and for their identity to be remembered. The passer-by then participates in the commemoration of the deceased by stopping and reading the inscribed epigram.³¹ All three features, monument, epigram, and reader, work to ensure the perpetual *kleos* of the deceased. For Simonides, then, his poems on the Persian Wars ostensibly would have depended on the commission and, crucially, on their inscription of a monument for dissemination into the public.³² But instead of the cooperative commemorative effort between epigram and grave marker that was conventional to early epigram, I will show that Simonides' epigrammatic language downplays the role of the monument in commemoration.

It is not only the names of the dead that are left out of the language of Simonides' epigrams, but also the names of the living persons responsible for the monument and epigram's commission. In this respect too Simonides will depart from the norms of epigram. *CEG* 11 (ca. 460-50), for example, explicitly names the Athenians as the

³⁰ Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 114-122, 192; Gutzwiller (2010) 227-230.

³¹ Day (1989) 24-28, Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 177.

³² For now I am treating the epigrams attributed to Simonides and the Persian War epigrams in particular as genuine Simonides, which would date them to the first half of the fifth century. However, as I will explain shortly, his authorship of these epigrams is contested.

dedicators of the tomb for Pythagoras, προξενίας ἀρετῆς τε χάριμ προ(γ)όνων τε καὶ αὐτῷ | ἐνθάδ' Ἀθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρην ἔθεσαν | υἱὸν δημοσίαι Διονυσίου ἱππόβοτον δὲ | πατρίδα Σαλυβρίαν ἴκετο ἄχος φθιμένο, “In recognition of the progeny and excellence of his forebears and himself, here the Athenians laid Pythagoras publicly, the son of Dionysius”.³³ This epigram further specifies that the epigram and its stone are dedicated in an act of *charis* for Pythagoras, which attests to the stone’s function as an *agalma*, an object of beauty, and to the Athenian’s prominent role in fashioning such an object.³⁴ In this example we can see the potential that an inscribed monument has for perpetuating the *kleos* of its dedicator in addition to that of its dedicatee. The inclusion of the dedicator’s name along with that of the figure to whom the monument is dedicated ensures that *both* will be remembered through time. That Simonides’ epigrams on the Persian Wars do not reference their dedicators in similar fashion indicates that these works were not intended to further the *kleos* of the people responsible for their existence.

Further evidence for the practice of including the dedicator’s name(s) comes from other epigrams for war dead. The series of epigrams for the Athenians who died at Potidaea (*CEG* 10, ca. 432) makes clear that the persons commemorated are Athenians, and the third in this triad of poems names the πόλις and δῆμος of Erechtheus as the erectors and dedicators of the monument. These examples post-date Simonides, but this fact demonstrates even more clearly that it was conventional to name a tomb’s dedicator and, more importantly, that this was a convention that persisted in epigrammatic

³³ trans. Bowie (2010).

³⁴ Day (2010) 88-106. The theme of *agalma* is largely outside my purposes here, as it applies mostly to dedicatory epigrams.

composition even after Simonides had diverged from it. That Simonides does not include such information in this poem both further obscures the identity of the commemorated deceased and, in so doing, breaks from the generic conventions of early epigram. The absence of this kind of information about the deceased requires a well-informed reader to discern the specific circumstances of the epigram's commission and dedication.

To summarize so far: important commonalities in epigram persist through both the archaic and classical periods: 1) the importance of the monument's placement in an area easily accessible to mourners and passersby (in the classical period in particular, roadside funerary monuments seem to have become commonplace);³⁵ and 2) the formulaic contents of gravestone inscriptions, always including, at a minimum, the name of the deceased.³⁶ Together, these features illustrate an interdependent relationship between the monument and its inscription. The contents of the epigram (epitaph), together with the monument, work to guarantee the continual commemoration of the deceased and generate *kleos* for the deceased, both by naming the person and by inviting passing individuals to read. Moreover, the naming of the monument's creator alongside the name of the deceased ensures the perpetual *kleos* of the dedicator as well as that of the deceased. Thus the commemoration captured by an epigram is not always just about the dead, but also about the commemorative efforts rendered by those still living.

³⁵ Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 92-96.

³⁶ Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 86.

An impersonal third-person voice is used most often for the commemoration of the dead in early epigram.³⁷ Significantly, although it occurs less frequently, epigrams speak in the voice of the dedicated object itself.³⁸ Even more rarely, the first-person voice can be used as the voice of the deceased, as in the case of Phrasikleia's epigram (*CEG* 24). Although the inclusion of the deceased as the epigram's speaker is rare in archaic epigram, in two of the Simonidean epigrams on the Persian Wars, the dead directly address their readers (92D and 121D). Making the epigram speak in the voice of the dead themselves serves two purposes. First, it contributes to a less object-dependent status of the epigram, as the presence of an object is not required by the language of the text, as it would be in an epigram of the "this is the *sema* of X" type. This latter type requires the presence of an object as a referent for the poem's reference to the monument. That the epigram speaks as the deceased themselves concentrates the reader on the commemorated person, and not on the grave marker.

Second, to make the dead the speakers of their own epigram underscores the transition that has taken place in the identity of the deceased, from living to dead because the use of this voice shows that the dead is aware of this transition. This makes the dead, not an impersonal speaker, the shapers of their own identities after death. For an epigrammatist to manipulate the speech of the dead in this way and make the deceased interact with the living reader is to capitalize on the epigram's function as *sema*. Thus I

³⁷ i.e. "This (demonstrative) is the tomb of X". cf. Vestrheim (2010) 67-70.

³⁸ The most famous example being Mantiklos' epigram, *CEG* 326, "Mantiklos set me up..." (Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεκε) and *CEG* 24, the tomb of Phrasikleia, "σῆμα Φρασικλείας. κόρε κεκλῆσομαι αἰεὶ, / ἀντὶ γάμο παρὰ θεὸν τοῦτο λαχὼς ὄνομα."

shall argue that when Simonides uses this voice in his epigrams, it helps construe the identity of the dead as a collective martial force.

The frequency with which the impersonal third-person voice appears in early epigram may be attributed to its ability to confer praise. As part of the preservation of the dead person's *kleos*, epigrams commonly include descriptions of the virtues of the deceased. This ensures the continued remembrance of their virtues even in death.³⁹ Moreover, the mention of their virtues in a person's epigram shapes their identity in death in that they become defined by the characteristics included in their epigram.⁴⁰ Even more importantly, it is only in the third-person voice that we see overt praise for the dead that lauds their specific virtues or acts.⁴¹ Epigrams that incorporate the first-person voice do not make value judgments on their own achievements, and the epigrams of Simonides that use this voice prove no exception.⁴² I will show how Simonides' use of the first-person voice, and in particular the first-person plural voice, is a further way in which he diverges from the conventions of early epigram in order to shape a more democratic *ethos* for his subjects, one that favors the collective voice of "we" over overt praise for a specific entity.

Originally, inscribed epigrams did not include the name of the author. It was not until in the fourth century do epigrammatists begin to attach their names to inscriptions.⁴³

Thus it is reasonable to assume that Simonides did not attach his own name to his

³⁹ Vestrheim (2010) 65-71.

⁴⁰ e.g. *CEG* 41, 479, 519, 546.

⁴¹ Much later, in the fourth century, epigrams appear in which the dead praise their own virtues, such as *CEG* 493, 553, 554, 560, 577, 585.

⁴² Vestrheim (2010) 71-75.

⁴³ Gutzwiller (1998) 48.

epigrams. In keeping with this custom, part of the difficulty of distinguishing “true” Simonides from pseudo-Simonides is the fact that authors who quote epigrams in their own works do not usually name their author. The epigram for Megistias is exceptional, and universally accepted as the work of Simonides, because Herodotus makes a point of associating Simonides’ name to the poem, even if he does not name him explicitly as the author.⁴⁴ It is unclear to what extent Simonides may have expected his own voice to be recognized in his epigrams, but the presence of a Simonidean sylloge, the *Simonidea*, attests to the persistence of Simonides’ name in association with Persian War epigrams from the classical period on. His name becomes a figurehead for the subject of the wars in a way entirely unlike any previous epigrammatist. Genuine Simonidean authorship, however, is a vexed issue. The authenticity of the epigrams on the Persian Wars is particularly elusive,⁴⁵ and Higbie’s recent characterization has it that only 83D, Simonides’ epigram for the seer Megistias, is generally accepted as “authentic” Simonides.⁴⁶ In discussing the poems individually I will address the authenticity issues relevant to each, but for now it is sufficient to highlight the fact that Simonides, or “Simonides,” became the mouthpiece for the Persian War dead. At this point I will now discuss the specific Simonidean epigrams that form the basis of my study.

⁴⁴ Herodotus (7.228.1) instead names Simonides as the *epigrapas* of the work, which may refer both to Simonides’ composition of the epigram as well as his possible commission of the monument.

⁴⁵ Campbell (1982) 380.

⁴⁶ Higbie (2010) 187.

Chapter Two: The Epigrams--Text and Transmission

The epigrams that I will study here (92D, 91D, 90D, and 121D) have the following features in common. They are all *polyandreia*, created on behalf of the state or a body of people in order to commemorate a group of war dead. They all deal with the events of the Persian Wars (thus excluding such epigrams as 87D, which commemorates the Euboeans who were defeated at the hands of the Athenians). And they are all attributed to Simonides by *ancient* authors (if not by contemporary or near-contemporary sources).⁴⁷ That the epigrams I have gathered here are the ones with the strongest claims to authenticity derives in part from these explicit attributions by ancient authors. In terms of chronology, the closer to Simonides' lifetime an attribution is made, the greater the credibility of the source, making Herodotus the most important of my sources for this reason. Some epigrams, such as 120D, fit the criteria listed above, but are generally dismissed as later innovations and are assuredly not the work of Simonides.⁴⁸

I also exclude 88D, as my purpose here is to study those poems which were clearly intended as epitaphs that would be inscribed at the gravesite.⁴⁹ Epigraphical material evidencing the poems' inscription thus constitutes another facet of the standards I have used to evaluate the poems' authenticity. In this section, I will first offer a brief

⁴⁷ This rules out 93D, the epitaph for the Locrians at Thermopylae, as the attribution to Simonides is modern and rests on the ancient habit of attributing epigrams on the subject of the Persian Wars to Simonides. My focus here is not to claim whether or not such an attribution is valid: rather, my interest is in unpacking *how* this habit came to develop and on what basis, cf. Molyneux (1992) 183.

⁴⁸ This also includes 95D, which, although it deals with the events of the Persian Wars, is fraught with difficulty due to the addition of (possibly) later couplets, making it impossible to distinguish which lines, if any, formed part of the original inscription.

⁴⁹ 88D presents a number of difficulties with respect to the *type* of monument on which it was inscribed, difficulties that are outside my purpose here.

explanation of the circumstances of each of the epigrams' transmission, and explain in detail how each these poems fit the criterion of authenticity set out above. My argument does not rest wholly on the truthfulness of an attribution to Simonides, but it is important that there at least be good reason to associate the poems with a Simonidean name. From this section I shall move on to a discussion of the stylistic peculiarities that I claim are constitutive of a Simonidean style and persona and show how these qualities are manifested in this group of epigrams.

Since most of the Simonidean epigrams, with the exception of 121D, are transmitted to us not from inscriptions, but from the quotations of later authors, it will be useful to first discuss the contexts of the attributions of Simonides' name to the poems on the Persian Wars. This complicates the task of distinguishing authentic Simonidean epigrams from the spurious, as the epigrams that exist only as literary, and not inscriptional, artifacts are possibly later inventions or imitations that were never inscribed.⁵⁰ Although it was not the custom for the epigrammatist's name to be inscribed on the stone along with the poem, the discovery of an inscription of Simonides 121D offers concrete evidence that the poem was composed during Simonides' career. Without this epigraphical basis, however, we have only the attestations of later authors for determining both the content of Simonides' poems and the appearance and location of their inscription. Since I argue that one of the facets of Simonidean style consists in the less object-dependent content of these epigrams, the comments of authors as to the

⁵⁰ For instance, Page (1981) denounces 120D as "a literary composition, probably from the later Hellenistic age" (197), and treats 119D in the same fashion (217).

inscriptional nature of these epigrams is of particular significance. In this section, therefore, I will offer evidence for treating this group of poems as epitaphs, and thus for examining their relationship to their physical environment.

In discussing the literary tradition in which Simonides appears, my aim is to delineate the spread and persistence of the Simonidean name through time, but not in order to make claims as to the veracity of later authors' attributions. Although I have selected those epigrams that have the best claims to authenticity, my argument does not rest solely on their being the work of the historical Simonides. Rather, my purpose here is to establish the presence of a Simonidean poetic persona, if not the work of the historical Simonides. My focus is not exclusively on the reliability of a later author's attribution, as much as *why* and *how* he would cite Simonides as an author and expect his readers to believe it. This is particularly relevant for Herodotus, as he is the earliest source to quote Simonides and in this respect represents the most credible of my sources, being the chronologically closest to the historical Simonides. In other words, I am interested in what gave the author reason to believe that the epigram in question (even if it is not quoted directly) was Simonides'. The existence of a Simonidean poetic persona allows me to characterize certain features of style as "Simonidean." Therefore, I will set out the evidence for the existence of this persona as it is manifested in the transmission of each poem.

The Megistias epigram is the only extant epigram uncontestedly attributed to Simonides. This is so because of Herodotus' phrasing at 7.228.1, τὸ δὲ τοῦ μάντιος Μεγιστίεω Σιμωνίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπεος ἐστὶ κατὰ ξεινίην ὁ ἐπιγράψας, which explicitly

names Simonides as the composer of the Megistias epitaph. Poems 92D ((ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε | κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.) and 91D (μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο | ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες.) are the other poems mentioned in Herodotus 7.228.1-4 in connection with the epigrams on Thermopylae. Herodotus informs us that the Amphictyones commissioned these poems along with the Megistias epitaph and had them inscribed on *stelae* at Thermopylae.⁵¹

92D ((ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε | κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι "Oh stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here, obedient to their commands"⁵²) is cited in the same passage as the Megistias epigram, but it is unclear whether the ἐπιγράψας of that passage refers to the commissioner of the epigram or the actual composer.⁵³ Although it is impossible to say for sure whether Herodotus means to claim that Simonides composed all three of the epigrams referenced in this passage from Herodotus, the prevailing scholarly opinion is that this epigram, along with 91D, can be attributed to Simonides with relative safety. This is so because Simonides' name, by the time Herodotus was writing, had already become associated with epigrams on the subject of the Persian Wars.⁵⁴ This gives reason to look for features within these poems that we can characterize as Simonidean.

⁵¹ 7.228.1-4: ἐπιγράμμασι μὲν νυν καὶ στήλῃσι, ἔξω ἢ τὸ τοῦ μάντιος ἐπίγραμμα, Ἀμφικτύονες εἰσὶ σφέας οἱ ἐπικοσμήσαντες· τὸ δὲ τοῦ μάντιος Μεγιστίῳ Σιμωνίδῃς ὁ Λεωπρέπῃος ἐστὶ κατὰ ξεινίην ὁ ἐπιγράψας (7.228.4).

⁵² Unless otherwise noted, the translations provided are my own.

⁵³ Page (1981) 231, Molyneux (1998) 175-180.

⁵⁴ Higbie (2010) 186, Campbell (1982) 379-82.

Herodotus cites this work as one of the epigrams composed for the fallen of Thermopylae, and quotes in full this poem along with 92D and the epigram for Megistias in the passage quoted above (7.228.1). The author of the *Greek Anthology* attributes the poem to him explicitly (7.248). Diodorus Siculus quotes the poem without directly attributing it to Simonides, but simply says that it was the inscription set up for all the Spartans at Thermopylae.⁵⁵ Aristides is another who quotes the poem without direct attribution (28.65). The epigram is thus attributed to the name ‘Simonides’ fairly frequently.

91D, however, poses difficulties that deserve further consideration even if the poem is generally accepted as Simonidean, as the poem is drastically unlike any other epitaph in the subjects of its commemoration. Page has characterized this poem as “a strange sort of epigram”.⁵⁶ He says so because the poem, as he points out, is not an epitaph: it commemorates not only those who died, but also honors all those who were present for the battle and survived, μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο | ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες. "Once, three hundred from the Peloponnese battled against four thousand".

Because the poem commemorates the survivors along with the deceased, it is unclear to what extent the reader can expect the epigram to interact with the burial site or monument, since, on this account, not all the subjects of the poem will have been buried there. Page also dismisses the testimony of Herodotus in 7.228.4, reasoning that it is

⁵⁵ ἐπέγραψαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς Θερμοπύλαις ἀποθανοῦσι Λακεδαιμονίοις κοινῇ μὲν ἅπασι τόδε. (11.33.2)

⁵⁶ Page (1981) 232.

difficult to believe that the Amphietyones would commission an epigram that does not mention the contribution of the Thespians, whose entire force was destroyed.⁵⁷ This provides reason to doubt that the poem was intended as an inscribed epitaph. I will argue, however, that there are decidedly epitaphic features of its language that suggest an inscriptional context, rather than a purely literary one.

Herodotus' quotation of the poem makes clear that *he* at least accepted the poem as an inscription by making a point to emphasize how the epitaph marked the exact spot where the warriors fell: θαφθεῖσι δὲ αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ τῇ περ ἔπεσον, καὶ τοῖσι πρότερον τελευτήσασιν ἢ ὑπὸ Λεονίδεω ἀποπεμφθέντας οἴχεσθαι (7.228.1). Moreover, Herodotus here accepts without question the account that held that this was an epitaph. Herodotus has no problem in accepting the epigram's authenticity not only as an epitaph, but also as a poem that marks the exact spot where the soldiers fell. This suggests that Herodotus perceived the poem as suitably like other sepulchral inscriptions with which he had familiarity. Moreover, he must have expected his readers to also accept this poem as an epitaph.⁵⁸ Although on Page's reckoning, Herodotus is not to be taken to refer to a real epitaph here, the point is that, although Herodotus probably did not see the monument and inscription himself, he accepts the testimony of his source as to the nature of the poem's location and language without criticism.⁵⁹ This tells us that, to Herodotus

⁵⁷ Herodotus claims that this epigram was commissioned on behalf of all those at Thermopylae, ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τοῖσι πᾶσι ἐπιγέγραπται. Thus it would seem strange if the Thespians were not named in this poem.

⁵⁸ Fowler (2001) 108.

⁵⁹ Osborne (2002) 511-513.

and his audience, the poem must have seemed like a realistic epitaph, and thus, something that would exist in a physical environment.

The τῆιδε (μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῆιδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο | ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες) is one of the features that make the poem believable as an epitaph. The language of the poem makes much of its location, corroborating Herodotus' account that said that the epigram marked the very spot where the soldiers fell and were buried (7.228.2). The "here" must designate a physical space, since there is nothing else in the text to which it could refer. With the use of this deictic term, then, Simonides signals both the location where the dead fell and are interred *and* refers to the poem's status as an epitaph. I am here not trying to make any claims about the authenticity of the poem as an epitaph (as Page does); instead I am trying to point how Simonides (or 'Simonides') constructed the poem so as to make it seem epitaphic, or at any rate, epitaphic enough for Herodotus to accept this poem as that which stood at Thermopylae. The poem, then, does not appear to be a purely literary exercise, and therefore can be investigated in relation to the physical space in which it would have stood.

Although the transmission of most of the epigrams in literary works has prevented us from visualizing the original context in which the poems were inscribed, 90D represents an important addition to the Thermopylae epigrams because it was uncontestably an epitaph and therefore, will allow us to assume the presence of an object to accompany this work. This will enable us to discern the relationship that may have existed between text and object, and how this style differs from that of early epigram more generally. The couplet was discovered on a marble slab on Salamis, making it the

only poem in my group with a basis in epigraphy.⁶⁰ The poem has been restored as follows,

[Ὁ ξένε, εὖλυδρ]όν ποκ' ἐναίομεζ ἄστν Φορίνθο,
[νῦν δ' ἡμὲ Αἶα]ντος [νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς].

"Oh stranger, once we sailed from well-watered Corinth, now, Salamis, the island of Ajax, holds us".

Although the poem has been heavily restored, its existence as an inscription rules out the possibility that the epigram was composed as a literary exercise: a possibility that plagues many other Simonidean epigrams in the corpus.⁶¹ The literary tradition transmits this couplet with a second one that alludes to the circumstances of the battle.⁶² This second couplet, however, was not inscribed on the same stone and for a long time was held to be spurious.⁶³ I will exclude the second couplet from my study without asserting whether or not it forms a part of the authentic poem, but I leave it out of my particular study as I am concerned with the epigrams that are the most reliably attributed to Simonides. Favorinus in Dio Chrysostom is the only ancient author to attribute this poem to Simonides by name, and this several centuries later. And since this couplet does not appear in any form on the stone, it thus does not share the first couplet's claims to authenticity in that respect.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Page (1981) 202.

⁶¹ For instance, Page (1981) denounces 120D as "a literary composition, probably from the later Hellenistic age" (197), and treats 119D in the same fashion (217).

⁶² Dio Chrys. 37.18, [Plut.] malign. Herodot. 39, 870E.

⁶³ Campbell (1982) 398, Molyneux (1992) 192.

⁶⁴ Boegehold (1965) has made a strong case for the second couplet's inclusion in the original poem, but the intricacies of that debate are outside the scope of this paper. See Boegehold (1965) 6 for a fuller discussion of the stone's contents as it has been preserved.

This epigram appears in two different authors, Dio Chrysostom (but believed to be the work of Favorinus)⁶⁵ and Plutarch.⁶⁶ Both authors cite the epigram in an effort to refute Herodotus' account of the relationship between Corinth and Athens during and after the Persian Wars.⁶⁷ That these authors refer to Simonides as a source tells us two important points. The first is that the poem was still recognized, at least by some, as the work of 'Simonides' by the time they were writing several centuries later. This attests to the continued persistence of Simonides' name in conjunction with this epigram. Second, it suggests that the name of 'Simonides' served a particular purpose for the quoting authors. In the context in which Simonides appears in these works, in both authors' attempts to dismiss the claims of Herodotus, we can observe that the name 'Simonides' represented a credible source adequate to refute the claims of another source.⁶⁸ Whatever the intent was for the authors in incorporating the epigram, their quotations of Simonidean works illustrates the creation and persistence of an authoritative poetic voice. This makes clear that Simonidean epigrams must have appealed to a widespread audience, such that Simonides could be offered as a source to disprove another historical source.

⁶⁵ Higbie (2010) 190. The passage in which the attribution appears is as follows, Ἡροδότῳ γὰρ οὐ προσέχω, ἀλλὰ τῷ τάφῳ καὶ τῷ Σιμωνίδῃ, ὃς ἐπέγραψεν ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς τῶν Κορινθίων τεθαμμένοις ἐν Σαλαμῖνι· (37.18).

⁶⁶ ἐν δὲ Σαλαμῖνι παρὰ τὴν πόλιν ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς θάψαι τε τοὺς ἀποθανόντας, ὥς ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γενομένους, (καὶ) ἐπιγράψαι τόδε τὸ ἐλεγείον· (*de mal. Herod.* 870E-71C)

⁶⁷ Plutarch does not explicitly attribute this epigram to Simonides, but Favorinus does (37.18). Plutarch uses Simonides as a source for refuting Herodotus' assertions about the Corinthians shortly after he quotes 90D. This demonstrates that Simonides was considered a source of truth with which to contradict Herodotus' account (Higbie 2010: 196). Since 90D is ascribed to no other epigrammatist, I follow Higbie (2010) in accepting the epigrams on the Persian Wars that Plutarch quotes as "Simonidean", even if Plutarch does not attach Simonides' name to each of the ten epigrams he cites.

⁶⁸ Higbie (2010) 187-196.

121D illuminates several of the difficulties peculiar to the poem's transmission in the literary record, and has been handed down as follows,

ἄσβεστον κλέος οἶδε φίλῃ περὶ πατρίδι θέντες
κυάνεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος.
οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' ἀρετὴ καθύπερθε
κυδαίνουσ' ἀνάγει δώματος ἐξ Αἵδεω.

These men cast about them the black cloud of death, and in doing so, placed undying glory about their fatherland. Nor do they die in dying, since their excellence, doing honor to them, leads them up from below in the house of Hades.

The difficulty here is that the author of the Greek Anthology attributes the poem to Simonides under the heading, Σιμωνίδου· εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς μετὰ Λεωνίδου πεσόντας (7.251), thus making it a work on Thermopylae, but Pausanias attests that the Spartans and Athenians who died at Plataea had separate graves inscribed with Simonidean *elegia* (9.2.5)⁶⁹. Since Herodotus makes no mention of this poem in his account of the epigrams inscribed at Thermopylae (7.228.1-4), this led Bergk to conclude that this epigram refers not to Thermopylae, but to Plataea.⁷⁰ Page also accepts Herodotus' silence about this poem as good evidence that this poem was not among those composed for the battle of Thermopylae.⁷¹ The point to be drawn here is that the language of the poem, as I will discuss shortly, does not provide conclusive evidence either way as to the battle that it is intended to commemorate. This epigram represents a case in which authors agree on the attribution to Simonides, but disagree as to the circumstances of its composition. But

⁶⁹ τοῖς μὲν οὖν λοιποῖς ἐστὶν Ἑλλήσι μνημα κοινόν· Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς πεσοῦσιν ἰδίᾳ τέ εἰσιν οἱ τάφοι καὶ ἐλεγείᾳ ἐστὶ Σιμωνίδου γεγραμμένα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.

⁷⁰ cf. Page (1981) 199-200 and Campbell (1982) 401.

⁷¹ Page (1981) 197. He also makes the important point that, if this poem as well as 118D were Hellenistic literary exercises, "it is certain that they would have made it clear that this [Thermopylae] was their theme" (197). This is further evidence in support of my general thesis that Simonides' style for *polyandreia* epigrams does not include such marked references.

what is significant for my purposes is just that the name ‘Simonides’ was presented as the composer of this poem in the Greek Anthology, as well as the composer of epigrams on the fallen of Plataea in Pausanias. This epigram, then, can be treated as an exemplum of a Simonidean poetic persona.

The attributions of poems to Simonides are from a range of authors spanning several centuries of time. This demonstrates the bond between the Simonidean name and the Persian War epigrams. In addition, it illustrates the authority with which the name ‘Simonides’ was invested with respect to the commemoration of the war dead. This evidences the widespread acceptance of the Simonidean name as a credible source on the Persian Wars. This suggests that there must have been something distinctively ‘Simonidean’ about these poems that encouraged their transmission over hundreds of years *and* which vested the persona of Simonides with such far-reaching acclaim. Whether or not these attributions are genuine, they attest to the existence of a Simonidean poetic persona, and furthermore, of Simonidean *kleos* that consists in the continued use and re-use of these epigrams as forms of evidence. Having delineated the Simonidean persona in this way, I will now examine the stylistic peculiarities of these epigrams that constitute a Simonidean style of commemoration.

Chapter Three: Simonidean Style

In this section I will present each of the features of these epigrams that I argue are constitutive of a distinctive Simonidean style of epigram. In doing so I will explain how this group of epigrams manifests those features to the end of furthering a democratic *ethos* that focuses the reader's attention on the achievements of the *collective* rather than individual. I will concentrate on the following features in the following order. First, I will consider the absence of the deceased's names in these epigrams and examine how the dead are characterized in these epigrams. Second, I will study the poems' lack of references to dedicators or commissioners. These first two sections, therefore, are intended to illustrate the lack of naming that I argue characterizes this group of epigrams. Third, I will examine the poems' relationships to their physical settings and delineate how the language of these epigrams de-emphasizes the physical setting of the grave marker and circumstances of the burial. Finally, I will posit the characteristics of the type of reader that Simonides expects for his epigrams. Given the paucity of information that he conveys about his subjects, Simonides anticipates a more knowledgeable audience than is typical for most early epigrams.

There are two main ways in which the language of the epigrams creates a democratic *ethos*. First, the poems are distinctive for their lack of explicit reference to particular names: names of the deceased, for instance, or of the specific battle. This suggests that, in contrast to other early epigrams, the identity of the deceased (and the epigram's inclusion of identifying features) is not the primary focus of these poems. Second, that Simonides leaves out information that would conventionally be present in

order to secure the identification of the deceased suggests that he assumes a readership familiar with the subjects and events of his poems. This is so because it is difficult to see how his poems could function commemoratively if it was not clear to his readers whom he was commemorating. That Simonides manages still to become the poet of the Persian Wars indicates that his commemoration of the Persian War dead was perceived as laudable, despite the peculiarities of his style in contrast to that of contemporaneous poems. I claim that Simonides achieves his *kleos* as the poet of the Persian Wars because his epigrams emphasize that a great victory was achieved specifically by the soldiers' collective sacrifice. The focus is on the triumph of the group. Simonides' epigrams, while they do not distinguish the individual identities of the fallen men, simultaneously create for them a *new* identity rooted in the victory achieved against the Persians. Further, I will argue that Simonides assumes a similar uniformity of identity among his readers and treats them as the Greeks who defeated the Persians. These epigrams, then, recognize the equality both of their deceased subjects *and* their readers.

The most distinctive of the Simonidean features that I will consider is the absence of specific names from the contents of the epigram. Since names are what enable the reader to identify the monument and epigram as belonging *to* someone, Simonides must expect his readers to identify the dead in some other way, as names are constitutive of the deceased's identity. In this section I will concentrate on the absence of the deceased's names, and in a separate section consider the absence of dedicators' names.

Simonides' 92D is devoid of specific names, and despite this, it has also become the most famous of the Simonidean epigrams,

ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε
κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.

"Oh stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here, obedient to their commands"

Although the language is not explicit on this point, it seems reasonable to assume from the text (Λακεδαιμονίοις) that the deceased, the speaking 'we', are Spartans. However, the text does not specifically name the speakers, the deceased, as Spartans. That the dead themselves speak, captured in the first-person plurals κείμεθα and πειθόμενοι, is an unusual feature. Among early epigrams a first-person speaker is not uncommon, but it is usually used in the singular and is often the inscribed object: "I am the tomb of so-and-so."⁷² The sheer number of the dead hinders the inclusion of additional detail such as one would normally encounter in archaic epigram, such as a patronymic.⁷³ But the plurality of speakers, which does not single out and identify any member of the group, makes even the identification of the speakers as "Spartans" less specific than a reader might need to ascertain the subjects of the poem.

The specific verb, κείμεθα, indicates that the "we" is the group of people marked by the epigram. This posits the dead in direct contact with the readers. The use of the first-person voice adds a further dimension to this characterization by making the dead *self*-identify as obedient and thus, it is the dead themselves who cite this quality as that which defines them eternally in death. That the dead have characterizes themselves this way signals that, to the dead, obedience was their most pertinent attribute during their lifetimes.

⁷² Vestrheim (2010) 71-73.

⁷³ Day (2010) 132-141.

It is significant that obedience, and not their victory, is highlighted as the defining quality of the dead. The epigram expects the reader to be cognizant of the warriors' contribution to the defeat of the Persians. Knowledge of the victory, coupled with the identification of the dead as "obedient", conveys the message that victory was achieved through the collective obedience of this body of men. That the men are clearly distinguished in no other way serves to encapsulate this very democratic message by portraying them as a mass and not a group of distinct individuals. Moreover, this message becomes clear thanks to the details that Simonides has left out of the epigram, the information that would identify the dead with certainty.

The deictic τῇδε confirms that the speaking "we" is the voice of those buried in that particular place. The meaning of the verb used, "lie" combined with the deictic τῇδε affirms that the speaker(s) must be the buried deceased, but the absence of additional information underscores their anonymity, and moreover, that this is anonymity derived from their plurality. Moreover, this is a unified collective, undifferentiated by individual names and tribes. On the other hand, it is possible that casualty lists with the names of the individual dead, inscribed on separate *stelai*, may have formed an additional separate part of the grave marker. Such lists would have provided individual identities for the speaking "we," but if there existed such lists, the epigram does not incorporate them into its language.⁷⁴ If casualty lists did accompany this epigram, the language of the poem does not allude to them, as we would expect it to do if the lists did feature within the physical

⁷⁴ Page (1981) 202, 222, see also Jacoby (1945) 169 and especially 172 n. 56.

setting of the epigram.⁷⁵ Such lists are conventionally referred to with οἶδε, not the first-person plural voice.⁷⁶ Instead, the only identifying characteristic applied to this group is “obedience,” πειθόμενοι, marking the dead solely in terms of their obedience and anonymity.

We can look to the poem’s address to the passer-by, ὦ ξεῖν’, as another means of characterizing the speaking dead because of their appellation of the epigram’s reader as a “stranger”. An address to a passer-by is certainly not uncommon among archaic epigrams and later becomes a trope in both classical as well as Hellenistic epigrams, but that the epigram addresses the passer-by specifically as a “stranger” is unusual for this period.⁷⁷ Usually, the epigram’s reader is addressed explicitly as a passer-by, with ὁ παριών or similar.⁷⁸ The appellation does appear in a few epigrams prior to Simonides in *CEG* 13, 462, 112, but only in conjunction with ἀστός and never as an exclusive designation for the passer-by.⁷⁹ In these examples, ξένος is always paired with another term in order to make an inclusive address, i.e. one that appeals to *all* possible readers.

The use of ξένος on its own is significant because it indicates that the epigram will be read *exclusively* by strangers and *not* by people familiar to the dead. Seemingly only after Simonides’ use of this term does “stranger” become a common appellation for the

⁷⁵ Cf. the epitaph for the Erechtheid Tribe, Meiggs/Lewis 33 (26), in which a demonstrative pronoun (hoίδε) explicitly alludes to the list of names below. See also Page (1981) 227.

⁷⁶ Page (1981) 227.

⁷⁷ Tueller (2010) 42-60, Gutzwiller (1998) 197-199, Bruss (2005) 73, 75.

⁷⁸ Tueller (2010) 51.

⁷⁹ *CEG* 13, [εἴτε ἀστός] τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὼν; 112: ἀσσοῖ[ς] καὶ χσένοισι Φάνες φίλος [ἐνθάδε κεῖται], |; 462: [- ὦ - ἀσ]τοῖσι{ν} καὶ αἱ πέ(ρ) τις ξένος ἔλ[θη] |. Tueller (2010) 51 n.14.

epigram's passerby.⁸⁰ However, the use of "stranger" as sole appellation for the reader not only shows the dead as cognizant of their place of burial, but also alludes to the geographical isolation of Thermopylae itself. This feature of the site of burial would make most everyone who read the epigram a stranger, someone just passing through the area. Seen in this way, the speaking dead make their address all-inclusive and treat all the poem's readers equally, that is, as passers-by to the specific site of Thermopylae.

The use of "stranger" as an address in the context of the Spartan dead at Thermopylae carries an additional kind of resonance because it underscores that many of the addressees of the epigram are going to be strangers to the Spartan speakers, that is, that they are *not* Spartan. As tradition dictated the burial of war dead where they had fallen, most if not all of the Persian War dead would be interred outside of their native *poleis* among strangers. The battles of the Persian Wars that provided the occasion for the epigrams' composition is what has removed the speaking deceased from their native territories to be interred among strangers. Moreover, this address, in the voice of the dead, tells us that the people buried here themselves recognize that those who read their tombstone will likely be non-Spartans. The dead are aware that *their* people, the Spartans, may not only not read the inscription, but they also suppose that the Spartans may not even know that they are dead. Conversely, the dead recognize that those who *do* encounter the epitaph and its message are strangers.

Although it is not unusual for epigrams to make appeals to their readers, in this instance the combination of the designation of the reader as a "stranger" and the

⁸⁰ Tueller (2010) 51-2.

command to ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις works to explicitly incorporate the epigram's reader into the commemorative work of the poem. This type of interaction with the reader is distinct from an epigram that orders the reader to "stop and show pity",⁸¹ for example, because the dead are the speakers of this poem and, by addressing the passer-by in this way, manifest their awareness of the act of reading that will accompany the epigram. They manipulate this feature of the epigram in order to construe the passer-by as a link between their place of burial and their native territory of Sparta. This formulation, of the speaking dead addressing their readers as "stranger" thus works to include the non-Spartans as part of the same commemorative entity by allotting the non-Spartans a specific role in the commemoration of the Spartan fallen. The epigram, then, simultaneously alludes to the circumstances of war that dictate their burial among foreigners, and it formulates a unified entity to be involved in the commemoration of the dead: the foreigners *and* Spartans.

To order the passer-by in this way not only achieves this unifying effect, it also distinguishes the poem's language from the norms of epigrammatic speech. Conventionally, the language of epigram makes references to its physical setting. In this way the poem focuses the reader's attention on the monument on which the poem is inscribed since, as described above, the grave marker and epigram are supposed to commemorate together. However, the command to convey a message to the Spartans directs the reader *away* from the tomb, de-emphasizing the role of the grave marker. This address to the passer-by, then, emphasizes the message of the poem, and the need to

⁸¹ A command that we observe in *CEG* 28, στῆθι | καὶ οἴκτιρον ; σῆμα Θράσωνος.

convey it, as opposed to the physical objects in its proximity. I will say more on this below in my discussion of the features of the epigrams that render them less object-dependent than other early epigrams.

The identification of the work in later sources as a poem on the Spartan dead of Thermopylae indicates that the identity of the speakers was evident to those who saw the inscribed epigram.⁸² But that the epigram is *not* explicit on this point represents another important difference from the conventions of early epigram. In other cases where the epigram commemorates a body of people, the text makes clear to whom the epigram and its accompanying inscription refer.⁸³ Here, however, Simonides appears to expect his readers to identify the speakers of the epigram on their own. At first, this reliance on the reader's knowledge seems problematic and out of step with traditional epigrammatic language. The latter makes the identification of the deceased a priority. This is evident in the formulaic inclusion of individual names and patronymics within early epigrams. Without the reader's knowledge that the poem was composed for the dead of Thermopylae, or indeed without knowing the specifics of the battle (which would include the involvement of the Spartans), the passer-by would have no way of knowing a) who is speaking in the epigram and b) who is being commemorated by the poem. This seems problematic, given the purpose of an epigram, which is to commemorate. The language of the poem assumes a certain degree of reader knowledge in order for its commemorative function to be fulfilled.

⁸² e.g. Herodotus, θαφθεῖσι δέ σφι αὐτοῦ ταύτη τῇ ἔπεσον... ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τοῖσι πᾶσι ἐπιγέγραπται, τοῖσι δὲ Σπαρτιήτεσι ἰδίῃ, “ὦ ξεῖν’...” (7.228.2).

⁸³ cf. CEG 179, Meiggs/Lewis 33 (26), CEG 4, 7.

But it is equally clear that this was an unproblematic expectation. The poem has been transmitted through the literary tradition as a work on the Persian War dead, making clear that readers had no difficulty in identifying the subjects of this epigram. Whether or not Herodotus in 7.228.1-4 means to claim that Simonides himself composed this epigram, the point is that, at the very least, he is able to confidently identify the epigram as a work for the Spartans, τοῖσι δὲ Σπαρτιήτησι ἰδίῃ (7.228.2). Even in the absence of the identifying features that appear in most other epigrams, Simonides still manages to identify his subjects in a new, different way that capitalizes on their collective anonymity as well as their obedience.

So far the absence of names from these epigrams has served to capitalize instead on the mass nature of the warriors' death, and 92D functions similarly. This emphasis on the group is conveyed by the absence of the features of epigram that serve to clearly identify and individuate the dead persons, as this emphasizes the collective anonymity of the speaking "we". This is so because the lack of explicit naming renders the speakers anonymous as individuals. By breaking from epigrammatic convention in the specific ways that he does, e.g. by leaving out typical features of epigram, Simonides draws attention to what *is* said about his subjects: namely, the mention of the Spartans, the speaking voice of a collective "we," and of the obedience of the speakers. The poem's language thus forges a new kind of identity for its subjects: as that of the Spartans who died en masse obedient to the demands of their native *polis*. In this way we see how a democratic *ethos* can be seen to suffuse this poem, and the specific linguistic ways in which Simonides has communicated this *ethos*.

91D, instead of using specific names, designates its subjects as numbers and thus forges an identity for them rooted in these specific figures. It too displays an interest in the collective body of men,

μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇιδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο
ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες.

“Once, four thousand from the Peloponnese battled against three million here.”

The dead are identifiable only insofar as ἐκ Πελοποννήσου allows. This does not single out one particular *polis* over another, and thus is not much help in determining the identity of the soldiers beyond the fact that they were Peloponnesian Greeks. One point on which the epigram *is* specific is in its commemoration of survivors along with the dead. This is conveyed by the main verb, ἐμάχοντο, which refers to all who fought there, not just those who died there. The emphasis is on the action that took place on the battlefield and not exclusively on its consequences. The poem’s lack of distinction between those who died in the battle and those who survived attests to a commemoration that is more interested in the efforts of the *whole* rather than the achievements or activities of a certain group. Moreover, the use of ἐμάχοντο as the main verb in the epigram, as opposed to, for example, ἔθανον, refers to a *kleos* that is determined on the battlefield alone, as distinct from the *kleos* inherent in death, and its commemoration. Unlike 92D, whose main verb, κείμεθα, clearly marked the poem’s speakers as the deceased, in this poem a third-person speaker is used to refer to the collective body of men as a fighting, not just a deceased, entity.

In addition to not distinguishing between the survivors and the fallen, the epigram gives no other indication as to the identity of the “they” who fought in the area of the epigram except for *χιλιάδες τέτορες*. Like 92D, this poem is markedly devoid of specific names. Instead, the epigram favors the inclusion of numbers rather than names: *μυριάσιν τριηκοσίαις* and *χιλιάδες τέτορες*. The use of these numbers instead of a more specific appellation has another important effect in that it spotlights the disparity between the number of those who fought from the Peloponnese against the enemy: four thousand versus three million. The fighters are characterized in terms of their quantity just because part of their *kleos* derives from their having battled a much larger body of men. That the epigram characterizes its subjects solely in terms of their quantity indicates that this number, and its contrast with the number of the enemy, is part of what constitutes the new identity of the dead: not only as being part of a mass, but more specifically as part of a body of four thousand men who battled three million. By portraying the dead *only* in terms of this quantity, this appellation then shapes the *kleos* of the deceased as something that consists just in being part of this specific *body* of people.

The use of this number alone instead of a more precise appellation tells us that Simonides expected a reader for whom this number alone would convey the identity of the dead and signify the precise battle at which they fell. And as in 92D, the other crucial piece of identifying information left out of this poem is mention of the victory achieved by the soldiers. This knowledge is crucial for the commemoration of the *χιλιάδες τέτορες*, as awareness of the victory at Thermopylae affords all those who fought there, and not just those who died, a share in the *kleos* and immortalization preserved by the

creation of this epigram. In this way we can see how Simonides privileges the *entire* fighting force. He distinguishes his subjects only as Peloponnesians (ἐκ Πελοποννήσου), and so does not privilege one *polis* over another, and further, does not afford those who *died* at Thermopylae more *kleos* than those who fought and survived. By the precise terms that he uses to characterize the dead, Simonides is able to shape a remarkably democratic *ethos* that affords the greatest *kleos* to the efforts of the mass, and not the individual.

The projection of the poem's subjects into the indeterminate past with ποτέ is another source of *kleos* on which the poem's language draws. This is so because of the timelessness conveyed by the indefinite ποτέ, which does not confine the subjects of the epigram to any particular point in time. The timelessness conveyed by the indefinite ποτέ serves a commemorative purpose in that its lack of a fixed point in time allows the subjects of the poem to be projected into an equally indeterminate future; in other words, for the deceased to be remembered for an indefinitely long period of time. However, the use of the indefinite temporal expression also renders the events of the battle inscrutable because the dead are not identifiable by the time or place at which they died. The ποτέ does not aid the reader in gauging the historical circumstances of the battle. Simonides appears to assume that his readers will know the battle to which he refers in this poem, and therefore, to which time ποτέ refers. But his use of this adverb has rendered this step unnecessary, because his language suggests that the subjects of his epigram belong now to the mythological rather than the chronological past. The indefiniteness of this temporal indicator assimilates the subjects of the epigram into a past populated by the Homeric

heroes and not by historical figures. Simonides clearly expects the reader to know to which battle he refers here, but that he does not mention it explicitly allows him to heighten the *kleos* of the poem's subjects by drawing a similarity between the soldiers of Thermopylae and the heroes of the mythological past. This he effects simply by using ποτὲ in preference to a more precise temporal indicator.⁸⁴

The epigrams on Thermopylae, 91D and 92D, thus convey a similar message, of the primacy of the collective over the individual. Here I am arguing that this *ethos* is communicated by the information that is *not* included in the poem's contents. Moreover, the poems convey such a message precisely because of the way in which they diverge from the conventions of early epigram, that is, by not explicitly naming their subjects. In neither poem does Simonides explicitly identify his subjects; rather, he includes only the details that will enable the reader to recognize the referents of these poems, and moreover, these are the details that shape the *kleos* of the deceased in a distinctively democratic way. In both poems, the dead are distinctive only insofar as they constitute a distinctive *mass*. In 92D, this was a group distinctive for its obedience, and in 91D, for its quantity in comparison to that of the enemy. The next two poems of my study will provide further evidence of the feature of Simonidean style that avoids specific names and manipulates the poem's language such that the dead are characterized *en masse* and not as specific entities.

⁸⁴ While epigrams do not normally specify the precise time of death, we would expect a mention or explanation of the circumstances of the particular battle in a *polyandreion* like this one, see Page (1985) 190, 227-8.

90D appears at first to be a counter-example to the nameless-ness of Simonidean style because it is more explicit in identifying its subjects, but I will show that it achieves the same effect as the other, less explicit epigrams. Meiggs and Lewis have provided the following restoration,

[Ὁ ξένε, εὖηυδρ]όν ποκ' ἐναίομες ἄστν Φορίνθο,
[νῦν δ' ἡμεῖς Αἶα]ντος [νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς].
O Stranger, once we sailed from well-watered Corinth,
now, Salamis, the island of Ajax, holds us.

Since the poem in its epigraphic form has been heavily restored, I will make sure here to distinguish between the contents of the poem as they are preserved on the stone and those parts that we have from later authors. I will make this distinction clear because the contents of the poem that come from the stone will constitute more reliable evidence of the characteristics of a Simonidean style.

As in 92D, the use of the first-person plural that is still evident on the inscribed stone stands out as an unusual feature for an epigram of this period. And this feature, like in 92D, is what enables the epigrammatist to make the dead the creators of their own *kleos* by making them the speakers of their own epitaph. The preference for this voice constitutes evidence of Simonides' democratizing or universalizing commemorative project, for the use of the first-person plural in this poem as well as 92D attests to an interest in preserving the group aspect of his subjects and not in making specific value judgments about that particular group of men. Whereas a third-person voice makes possible the overt praise of the dead, usually manifested in enumerations of the

deceased's virtues,⁸⁵ this epigram does not make praise of the dead a priority in its preference for the first-person plural voice.⁸⁶

Like 92D, the poem does not refer to the distinct identities of the individuals of the group through the speaking “we”, and characterizes them instead as part of an anonymous mass of fighters. However, the poem in its inscribed state provides a clue as to the identity of the commemorated through its Doric dialect, signifying the Corinthian origins of the speakers. The inclusion of a dialect particular to the deceased indicates that considerable care was devoted to the authenticity of the speakers' voice. The men were Corinthians, and as the epigram speaks in the first-person plural with ἐναίομες and ἄμ', it is natural that they would speak Doric Greek.⁸⁷ Moreover, as an epigram that was erected at Salamis, the dead are thus poised to address non-Doric speaking readers in their native dialect. This, like the Spartans' appeal to the passer-by in 92D to convey a message to Sparta, alludes to the martial circumstances of the epigram that makes the final resting place of the Corinthians outside their native territory. This martial characteristic of the deceased is identifiable in the address to the poem's reader, ὦ ξείν', that appears in the literary version of the epigram. This address fulfills a similar function to that which we observed in 92D, in that it underscores the dead's removal from their homeland. It also incorporates the non-Corinthian passer-by into the commemorative task of the epigram. Although the epigram's speakers distinguish themselves as Corinthians, that they invite

⁸⁵ See, for instance, *CEG* 530, χρηστή γυνή ἐνθάδε κείται | φιλοῦντα ἀντιφιλοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα Ὀνήσιμον ἦσθα κρατίστη; 519, Γλαῦκο παῖ Κλεόβολε, θανόντα σε γαῖα κα[λύπτει] | ἀμφότερον μάντιν τε ἀγαθὸν καὶ δορὶ μά[χεσθαι].

⁸⁶ Vestheim (2010) 73-75.

⁸⁷ for example, the use of the enclitic ποκά, the first person plural ending in -εϛ, and the use of Φ.

the reader to participate in their commemoration demonstrates that they consider themselves deserving of commemoration by others outside of their native *polis*. In addition, by relying on the reader for knowledge of the victory and not including that particular piece of information, the epigram's speakers assume that their readers will be able to recognize this feature of the deceased, and thus the speakers treat their passer-by as part of a uniformly knowledgeable entity, as part of the same panhellenic force that defeated the Persians.

The inscribed epigram is explicit in identifying the dead as Corinthians and the literary version is likewise explicit in naming Salamis as the place where they are interred. But Corinth also functions to draw a contrast with Salamis in the second couplet. Although the second line of the couplet is heavily restored, the inscribed tablet's inclusion of Corinth in the first line suggests that the inscribed poem made the same contrast as that provided by the literary quotations. By juxtaposing the speakers' place of origin with their place of burial, Simonides makes the dead appear aware of their new identities: they *were* Corinthians, but *now* they are commemorated as those who have fallen at Salamis. In the literary version of the poem, the placement of each word, Corinth and Salamis, in separate lines of the couplet underscores the disparity between these places by illustrating in the very appearance of the text this disjunction and distance between the locations.

The contrast between the speakers' new and old identities is heightened with the temporal disparity created by $\pi\omicron\kappa'$ and $\nu\nu\nu$. Although the latter is a restoration, the former does appear on the inscribed stone, and thus it seems reasonable to assume the

same temporal resposion between “once” and “now”, as it has been transmitted in the literary tradition, was preserved in the original poem as well. These expressions convey not only a disparity in time, but also display the speakers’ two opposing states of being, of life and death, that are marked by these shifts in time. Here the expression *ποκ*’ does not function in quite the same way as the *ποτε* of 91D, where the expression was used to project the event of the battle into the mythological, timeless past. The expression as it appears here, in opposition to *νῦν*, instead focuses the reader’s attention on the shift from “once” to “now,” the latter being occupied by Salamis, not Corinth. Corinth is illustrated as a temporary phenomenon, while Salamis is singled out as the place where the dead are immortalized in death.

The epigram singles out Salamis even more markedly with the inclusion of a patronymic, *Αἴαντος*. This detail contributes to the martial identity of the deceased because it designates the battle at which they died by a patronymic, rather than the place they were from. The latter would be the more conventional place for a patronymic, as Corinth is the native territory of the dead. An even more appropriate place for a patronymic, however, would be in application to the subjects themselves.⁸⁸ But this is impossible, given the plurality of speakers here. The epigram’s incorporation of this standard feature of epigram as it is deployed in an unconventional way (to a place rather than a person) thus posits Salamis as the source of the speakers’ new identity in death: those who died at Corinth.

⁸⁸ A few examples are: *CEG* 160, Ἀρχωνος πα[ίδος; *CEG* 154, ἐσλὸς ἐὼν Πολύιδος Ἐχεκρατίδης φίλος υἱός.

The epigram, then, identifies the dead more clearly than 91D and 92D, through its use of specific names like Corinth and Salamis. But it does so in order to emphasize the shift in that has taken place in the speakers' identity and still relies to a significant extent on its reader's knowledge. The poem does not, for example, tell us *why* the men sailed from their native Corinth,⁸⁹ and instead Simonides expects that the reader will be able to deduce from the mention of Salamis that this is a work in commemoration of that particular battle. Again, the epigram itself gives no indication of the victory to which the deceased contributed. In addition, the speaking "we" of the poem are marked as Corinthians, but are otherwise indistinct from one another. The use of the first-person plural underlines this multiplicity, and the disappearance of individual identity that comes with it. Instead, the poem creates for them a new identity couched in the deceased's being the group of Corinthians who died in the battle of Salamis. Moreover, the dead *themselves* expect the reader to know the circumstances of the battle to which the poem refers, although, as the poem makes clear, he is not Corinthian. This suggests the expectation of a uniformly knowledgeable audience. Even more importantly, the poem's speakers treat the passer-by as part of the same panhellenic force that won the battle. In this way, Simonides capitalizes on the group effort of the Corinthians and prompts his reader to share in the *kleos* of that group by remembering the significance of that battle: as a decisive victory against the Persians.

⁸⁹ An explanation of the circumstances of death is also common among early epigrams, Page (1981) 202.

Poem 121D is the most illustrative of the effect of the absence of specific names, as this makes it impossible to determine today whether it is an epigram in commemoration of the Athenians or Spartans,⁹⁰

ἄσβεστον κλέος οἶδε φίλη περὶ πατρίδι θέντες
κυάνεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος.
οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' ἀρετὴ καθύπερθε
κυδαίνουσ' ἀνάγει δῶματος ἐξ Αἵδεω.

These men, casting undying glory about their dear fatherland, enveloped themselves in the dark cloud of death. Nor in dying did they die, since glorifying excellence leads (them) up from the house of Hades below.

The reason that it is impossible to identify the poem's subject from the language of the epigram is because Simonides uses a demonstrative, οἶδε, to refer to his subjects and includes no other identifying details like the Φορύνθο of 90D or the Λακεδαιμονίοις of 92D. The confusion about the subjects of the poem, then, is a direct result of Simonides' avoidance of specific names. The only features used to characterize the dead are οἶδε and ἄσβεστον κλέος. By this characterization Simonides depicts his subjects solely in terms of their collective nature and by their ἄσβεστον κλέος.

The epigram mentions a “fatherland” (πατρίδι) and in this way alludes to the conventional practice of including the patronymic of the deceased in an epigram. As 90D manipulated this convention so as to emphasize Salamis as the source of the Corinthians' identity in death, the indefiniteness of πατρίδι here serves a similar purpose. The vagueness of the expression conveys the idea that the mass of men who died here is

⁹⁰ Although the Greek Anthology quotes this epigram under the heading, Σιμωνίδου· εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς μετὰ Λεωνίδου πεσόντας (7.251), Pausanias' mention of the epitaphs at Plataea (9.2.5) led Bergk to conclude that this epigram refers not to Thermopylae, but to Plataea. See also Page (1981) 199-200 and Campbell (1982) 401.

anonymous, devoid even of a patronymic designating their place of origin, and it is this group that has won glory here. Moreover, by not providing a more pointed referent for πατρίδι, Simonides does not privilege one Greek city over another as the provenance of the men's *kleos*. The non-specificity of οἶδε and πατρίδι enables the *kleos* of the dead men to be applicable to everyone. Each of the epigram's readers will have their own πατρίδι, and that the poem does not indicate which fatherland belongs to the men, who are identified only as οἶδε, enables the dead to effectively belong to *any* fatherland, including that of the reader. The indefiniteness of these terms thus creates a panhellenic audience for the soldiers' commemoration by not confining the deceased to any particular group, thus allowing the reader to think of the dead as part of their own community. By combining οἶδε and πατρίδι in preference to clearer identifying details, Simonides creates a general picture of his subjects that allows for their commemoration on a panhellenic scale.

Without specifying the circumstances under which the men achieved their ἄσβεστον κλέος, Simonides, again, anticipates the reader's awareness that the men commemorated here contributed to a Greek victory over the Persians. The point of these epigrams is not that the warriors were successful in destroying the Persians, but that it was a collective effort for which they lost their lives. He assumes a panhellenic spread of information about the events of the Persian Wars. The epigram makes itself a vehicle for the warriors' *kleos* and not for conveying specific historical facts about the battles and the people the poems commemorate. By not indicating to which ethnic group the *kleos* of the

commemorated belongs, Simonides encourages the spread of their *kleos* on a larger, panhellenic scale.

121D thus provides a clear example of the ways in which Simonides manipulates the conventional naming strategies of early epigram in order to achieve a different kind of commemoration for his subjects. By incorporating the vague and indefinite term in preference to the specific and concrete, Simonides creates two effects. The first is that he emphasizes the mass nature of the deaths and the anonymity that this entails. Second, the lack of explicit identifying details enables him to fashion a *new* identity for the war dead, that is, as mass bodies of men whose *kleos* consists just in their having fought as an anonymous, collective entity.

We also know from Herodotus' account that the Amphictyones were responsible for the commission of both 91D and 92D (7.228.4), but in neither poem are they mentioned by name. Nor is there anything in the poems that even hints at the identity of the poem's commissioners. This is particularly true for 92D, as this work is constructed to seem as though the dead themselves are speaking and thus, are the fashioners of their own commemoration. In this way the role of the dedicator in their commemoration is completely bypassed by the epigram's manipulation of its speaker(s). Even in 90D, which is the most explicit in its identification of the deceased as Corinthians (ποκ' ἐνάιοιμες ἄστυ Φορίνθο), does not make clear whether or not the Corinthians were responsible for the creation of the monument in a manner like *CEG* 11, which makes it plain that the Athenians were in charge of the funerary proceedings (ἐνθάδ' Ἀθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρην ἔθεσαν). As the relatives and compatriots of the deceased were often the ones behind a

commemoration of war dead, Simonides alludes to the identity of the dedicators, but does not render them specific.⁹¹ 121D, in similar fashion, alludes to but not does not specify a possible identity for the dedicators in its mention of the soldiers' homeland, πατρίδι.

The upshot of the absence of this kind of information from the epigrams studied here is that the poems in commemoration of the Persian War dead commemorate *only* the soldiers who participated in the battles and *not* the people involved in their commemoration. In this way, Simonides preserves the immortal *kleos* provided by his epigrams for the dead alone. Moreover, that Simonides often does not explicitly identify the ethnic origins of the deceased, as being of a particular *polis*, accords with his project of apportioning *kleos* just to the masses of soldiers, and not to the cities from which they come. In the absence of specific names, these poems speak to a panhellenic audience in that it is undifferentiated by *polis*. The commemoration of the dead is construed as the task of all of Greece, and the poems direct that commemoration exclusively towards the anonymous masses of dead, and not specific entities.

However, explicit names are not the only trait of epigrammatic language that Simonides leaves out of these poems. I will now turn to another common feature of epigrams that does not manifest itself in these epigrams, and that is their lack of references to the grave marker and physical setting. In this segment I will show how Simonides de-emphasizes the topographical setting of his epigrams and thus underscores the commemorative message in preference to the funeral display.

⁹¹ Pausanias (9.2.4) attests to the creation of separate tombs for the Spartans and Athenians, see also Page (1985) 198.

Typical archaic epigrammatic language firmly situates the reader at the site of the monument and inscription by means of demonstratives like “this tomb” or “this monument,” as in *CEG* 26, τόδ’ Ἀρχίο ’στι σῆμα · καὶ δελφῆς φίλες.⁹² In 92D, however, the physical location of the tomb is marked by the non-specific τῇδε (ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε κείμεθα). The difference is that a demonstrative like τόδε σῆμα is used in application to a specific particular object or person,⁹³ while a deictic like τῇδε is not and instead refers to a more general physical space. The use of this expression, rather than something like τόδε σῆμα or ἐνθάδε, in Bruss’ determination, relies on the reader’s awareness not of the monument, but of the general area in which the marker is placed.⁹⁴ By not highlighting any particular object in the poem’s vicinity, thus downplaying the role of the marker on which the poem is inscribed, Simonides de-emphasizes the role of the gravesite and its physical contents in commemorating the dead.

While a reference to the monument is not a formulaic feature of early epigram (as naming the deceased is, for example), it is certainly common among early epigrams.⁹⁵ Especially in the absence of other contextual information (such as names, as I have

⁹² *CEG* 46 succinctly illustrates the formula, σῆμα φί[λ]ο παιδὸς τόδε ἰδὲν Δι[όδωρος] ἔθηκεν; “Look, this is the tomb that Diodorus dedicated for his beloved child.” Other examples include, but are not limited to, *CEG* 470, 40, and 111.

⁹³ See, for example, *CEG* 174B, *CEG* 53, Λυσέαι ἐνθάδε σῆμα πατὲρ Σέμον ἐπέθηκεν; *CEG* 41, σῆμα πατὲρ Κλέ[β]βολος ἀποφθιμένοι Ξενοφάντοι/θῆκε τόδ’ ἀντ’ ἀρετῆς ἐδὲ σαοφροσύνης, “The father Klebolos made this tomb for the dead Xenophantos, for his virtue and *sophrosyne*. (trans. Vestrheim [2010]).

⁹⁴ Page also states that, as a general rule, the place of a *polyandreion* memorial is not named, “for it is assumed that the reader knows where he is standing” (*FGE* 197).

⁹⁵ See, for example, *CEG* 84: μνήμα Μνησαγόρας καὶ Νικοχάρος τόδε κεῖται; *CEG* 161, ἡ καλὸν τὸ μνήμα [πα]τήρ ἔστησε θανόσ[η]; one of the earliest extant examples of sepulchral epigram begins as follows, *CEG* 143, υἱοῦ Τλασίου Μενεκράτεος τόδε σῆμα.

discussed above) as to the site of the tomb and those who are buried there, it is marked that Simonides also excludes a reference to the monument. What's more, the command to the passerby to carry the epigram's contents *away* from the tomb to Sparta (ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε κείμεθα) contributes to the epigram's downplaying of the role of the monument. It achieves this by directing the reader to go elsewhere than the site of the tomb. This makes clear that the monument itself does not play a role in the commemoration of the dead, but rather that the epigram's *contents* are at stake in the preservation of the *kleos* of the dead. Moreover, that this is a view expressed in the voice of the dead themselves lends further credence to the primacy of the epigram's message over the inscribed object, as the speaking dead exclude the grave marker from their own self-commemoration.

Similarly, the subjects of the epigram itself may work to exclude the grave marker by undermining its indexical function. This is the case in 91D. Since the poem commemorates the living along with the dead, the grave marker does not function to provide a physical presence to all of those whom the epigram commemorates: since not all the subjects of the epigram died there, not all of them are buried beneath the monument.

The grave marker is likewise excluded from the other epigram on the Thermopylae dead,

μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο
ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες.

“Once, four thousand from the Peloponnese battled against three million here.”

That this epigram commemorates all those who fought and not just those who died changes the intrinsic function of the inscribed stone as a *sema*. In the case of this epigram, the *sema* is no longer a marker that signifies the transition from life to death. This is so because it immortalizes survivors along with the deceased and therefore does not mark out the place where the dead fell and are buried. The role of the *sema*, then, is reduced to a vehicle for the speech of the epigram and does not work in tandem with it to effect the commemoration. This change in the role of the stone is corroborated, as in 92D, by the use of τῇδε instead of a demonstrative that singles out the tomb alone. If we accept Herodotus' account that the poem marked the exact spot where the men had fallen (7.228.2), then the indefinite τῇδε illustrates a broader area than the tomb itself, that is, the area *around* the monument. The significance of the poem's physical setting rests not in the grave marker, but in the broader area where the battle actually took place.

The main verb of the epigram, ἐμάχοντο alludes to the martial circumstances of the poem's commission and provides further illustration of the epigram's interest in the area for its role as a battlefield as opposed to cemetery. The inclusion of the τῇδε, however, does indicate that the epigram was intended to interact with its physical surroundings, for without the poem's placement on the site of the battle, this deictic would have no referent and thus, no meaning. But the relationship forged here is not one between text and grave marker, as is the case with other early epigrams, but between text and space, and namely, the space of a battlefield. The language of the poem is therefore not object-dependent, in that it does not rely on the presence of a monument as a referent

for its language, but relies instead on the reader's grasp of the significance of the space in which he stands.

90D too expects the reader's awareness of a location's significance. This is the only one of the epigrams studied here that has been discovered as an inscription, and therefore should provide the most reliable indication as to the relationship created between the text of an epigram and its physical setting. Despite the existence of a concrete object in association with this text, the poem is devoid of deictic expressions. It does not refer to anything specific in the area of the tomb. While Salamis as well as Corinth are singled out, these do not pick out an area in close proximity to the grave marker, as even an indefinite deictic expression like τῇδε does. 90D, then, although it definitely existed as an epitaph, interacts even less with its physical setting than other epigrams which have not been recovered in their inscribed state. This offers proof that the lack of reference to a tomb within an epigram ascribed to Simonides does not make it any less likely to have actually existed as an epitaph,⁹⁶ since the epigram that we have found inscribed is similarly uncoordinated with its inscribed setting. For Simonides' commemorative task, then, the grave marker seems to play little role other than serving as a vehicle for the language of the epigram. The appearance of the marker seems to matter little as well, in contrast to the trend observable in other epigrams that seek to mark out the grave as a beautiful object, an *agalma*. That Simonides does not do this in any of his epigrams makes clear that his focus is on the *kleos* of the dead, and not on the

⁹⁶ Recall that the authenticity of 91D is debated in part just because of its lack of reference to an object, see Page (1985) 227.

commemorative efforts of the living that would be manifested in the appearance of the monument.

121D does make references outside the epigram in the form of the demonstrative pronoun οἷδε. While the demonstrative designation suggests that there are physical entities to which it refers (since it would be meaningless without a referent), that the poem has been transmitted outside of its inscriptional setting has made it impossible to tell from the language of the poem to whom the pronoun refers. The most natural referent for this term would be casualty lists: separate *stelai* inscribed with the names of the individual dead.⁹⁷ But even if such lists did accompany the epigram, the language of the poem itself provides no context for the names. It does not tell us at which battle they fell, for example. So even supposing the presence of casualty lists of names in conjunction with this poem, the reader is counted on to be able to connect the names with the occasion for the epigram and recognize which body of people the poem commemorates.

The inscription of this epigram and its placement, which would have been on a monument local to the site of the battle, is the missing piece of information needed to secure the identification of the poem's subjects. Our basis for determining the occasion of the epigram comes entirely from sources external to the text of the epigram itself. There is such a paucity of information here that it is reasonable to suppose that the only way to have known for certain whom the epigram commemorated was to have read the work *in situ*, on the battlefield. Even then, Simonides' reader would have had to be familiar enough with the events of the Persian Wars to be able to know whether Spartans or

⁹⁷ Page (1985) 201, 222, see also Jacoby (1945) 169 and especially 172 n. 56.

Athenians are commemorated by this text. And again, as in each of the poems studied here, the commemorative force of this epigram relies on the reader's knowledge of the significance of the place where the epigram has been erected and where the reader stands viewing the epigram.

The lack of reference to the grave marker thus prevails in Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars. This is what I have termed the less object-dependent facet of Simonidean commemorative style. Although the epigrams do rely, to varying degrees, on their physical setting in order for the epigram to be comprehended, the emphasis is not on the grave marker itself, but rather on the space where the battle took place and where the dead have fallen. In de-emphasizing the part of the grave marker in commemorating the war dead, Simonides creates two effects. The first is similar to that which we have observed in connection with his lack of reference to a dedicator. By not referencing the grave monument, Simonides does not call attention to the physical manifestation of commemoration that has been created at the expense of the living. In this way, Simonides avoids apportioning *kleos* to the poem's dedicators, who are responsible for the monument's creation. Second, the lack of reference to the grave marker keeps the readers' focus on the message of the dead, and not on the artifact created to represent them among the living. This suggests that the *kleos* of the dead is powerful and pervasive enough to be able to exist without the permanence afforded by inscription on a physical object.

However, the perpetuation of the warriors' *kleos*, the task of each of these epigrams, has been shown to depend to a considerable extent on a reader's familiarity

with the events of the Persian Wars. In each of these epigrams, the subjects of the poems' commemorations are unclear without contextual knowledge that is not provided by the epigram itself: information such as specific names, places, and events. This seems at odds with the epigrams' ostensible function, which is to preserve the memory and *kleos* of the deceased into an indefinitely long future. Simonides treats his audience as universally and uniformly knowledgeable about the specifics of the battles of the wars. Even when the poem addresses its reader as "stranger", the assumption still is that the reader, even though he is not of the same origins as the deceased, will still know the events and the people to which the epigram refers. Simonides thus creates a panhellenic dimension to these epigrams by expecting his readers to have the same degree of knowledge about the wars. Moreover, this expectation conveys the sense that the task of commemorating the Persian War dead was accorded to all of Greece, and all of the epigrams' readers, not just to those who were familiar with individual members of the deceased.

By excluding the type of information that he does, Simonides not only breaks from the conventions of epigram, but also uses the epigram's language as a means to privilege the collective effort instead of the individual triumph. He characterizes the dead as an anonymous mass, undifferentiated from one another as individuals, and undifferentiated from the epigram's readers in terms of their awareness of the battles. Both living and dead are supposed to know and remember the events of the Persian Wars. That Simonides anticipates a uniformly knowledgeable audience evidences a democratic *ethos* towards his readers as well as his subjects. He treats both groups as anonymous, uniform entities, and more importantly, as *one* group. The triumph that is never

mentioned in any of the epigrams, that of the victory of the Greeks against the Persians, is that which links the dead and the readers as one entity in which the readers are aware of all the circumstances that resulted in the death of the commemorated soldiers. Both subject and reader are characterized as part of the same collective force that defeated the Persians.

Chapter Four: Conclusions: the emergence of different types of *kleos*

It is clear that Simonides succeeded in his commemorative task in that these poems became detached from their inscriptional settings and incorporated into the works of later authors for various purposes. This indicates that these poems were perceived as more than adequately suited to their task of commemorating the Persian War dead. The name of Simonides thus acquired its own *kleos* because of his works on the Persian Wars, to such an extent that later authors used his work as evidence, imitated his style, and incorporated specific features of his poems, for example, the address to the passer-by as “o stranger”, so that it becomes a commonplace in the genre of epigram.⁹⁸ In this section I will investigate the implications of the existence of a Simonidean *kleos*, and how it relates to the *kleos* of the Persian War dead. My focus will be on the role of the Persian Wars as the dividing point between the archaic and classical periods. This is manifest in the allotment of *kleos* both to an individual poet for his composition of the poems, and to the anonymous, collective entities that are the subjects of his poems. The fame that Simonides achieves as an individual poet reflects the persistence of an archaic model of *kleos* in application to individual poets, whereas the celebration of the collective effected by the epigrams on the Persian War dead is indicative of the triumph of a democratic *ethos*.

⁹⁸ Tueller (2010) 51.

My purpose has been to set out the specific ways in which the epigrams on the Persian Wars that have been variously attributed to Simonides depart from the conventions of early epigram. This is tantamount to the creation of a distinctive Simonidean style. Further, I have characterized the Simonidean style of commemoration in terms of the *lack* of information that it conveys. I have identified three features that comprise this style. First, there is an absence of individual names, either of the deceased or of the epigram's commissioner. This underscores the collective, martial aspect of the war dead and the anonymity that results from their mass death. However, the poems emphasize that the *kleos* of the dead consists just in their being part of an anonymous group. Second, the poems use language that is less dependent on its inscribed object than that which we observe in other early epigrams. The poems establish a view of death and commemoration that favors the text and not the funeral display. That these epigrams manage to effectively commemorate the war dead without reference to funerary artifacts can be interpreted as a way of expressing favor for restraint in funeral display, in that these works evidence the superfluous role of the monument in the perpetuation of the *kleos* of the dead. Finally, the expectation of a uniformly knowledgeable audience of readers, able to fill in the gaps of information left by the epigram is another piece of the Simonidean democratic commemoration. In the absence of such details as patronymics, individual names, place names, and the like, Simonides renders a *new* identity for the deceased that consists in their having died as part of a group that fought on behalf of Greece. The effect of these absences is the portrayal of a democratic *ethos* that treats the

dead, the subjects of the epigram, *and* its living readers as part of the same entity: as the Greeks who conquered the Persians.

Whether or not these poems were all the work of the historical figure of Simonides, the point is that their transmission under the heading of his name attests to the perpetuation of a Simonidean *kleos* in which his authority on the Persian War dead resides. I claim that Simonides' epigrammatic style, and its ensuing popularity (seen in the perpetuation of the name "Simonides" in association with the poems), emerges due to Simonides' unique ability to encapsulate this democratic *ethos* in the language of his poems that posits the reader *and* the deceased as part of the same, panhellenic force. The task of commemoration is allotted to all of Greece, and not just to those with personal or political ties to the deceased. And it is this feature of Simonidean style that, I argue, encourages the growth of Simonides' fame as epigrammatist and the transmission of his name along with the epigrams. In other words, Simonidean *kleos* consists in the *kleos* he allots to the Persian War dead.

I have argued that the Simonidean style of commemoration was favored at least in part because of the merit of its democratic message. The anecdote concerning Pausanias' dedication on the base of the Serpent-column will provide further evidence as to the suitability of Simonides' epigrammatic style to the Persian Wars. This episode is illustrative of the Greek attitude towards the proper commemoration of the Persian War dead. Pausanias' dedication of an epigram that named him as the ἀρχαγός of the Greeks and the sole destroyer of the Persians was swiftly erased, testifying to the unacceptability of the idea that one person was deserving of singling out among the fighters of the

Persian Wars. Pausanias' epigram also includes some conventional features of epigrammatic language that, as I have pointed out above, are absent from Simonides' works on the Persian Wars: Ἑλλάνων ἀρχαγός ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων | Πausανίας Φοῖβῳ μνᾶμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε.⁹⁹ Here we see explicit reference to the dedicator (Πausανίας), a clear demonstration of the presence of a monument with μνᾶμ' τόδε, and an explanation of the circumstances of the dedication, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων. The naming of a particular individual, and moreover, the naming of that individual as ἀρχαγός stands in sharp contrast to the language of Simonidean epigram and the message conveyed within: one of anonymity *en masse*. Pausanias' epigram represents the *wrong* and unacceptable way to commemorate the Persian Wars: namely, via the commemoration of a particular individual. Simonides always speaks of the war dead in the plural and is general about their identity to the point of vagueness. Nowhere is this vagueness better typified than 121D, for which it still remains uncertain whether Simonides is commemorating Athenians or Spartans. But the important point here is that this feature of the epigram was not troubling to its contemporary readers. Rather, the continued transmission of these epigrams in conjunction with Simonides' name is a testament both to their success as commemorative endeavors and to their suitability for the subject of the Persian Wars.

However, these different allotments of *kleos*, one to the individual poet and one to a collective entity, seem to represent two distinct ideologies. The *kleos* accorded to

⁹⁹ Attested in Thuc. 1.132.2, Ps.-Demosth. *Or.* 59, 97; Aristodemus (*FGrH*) 2a 104 F I.108; Plut. *De mal. Herod.* 873 C 8=ch.42; Paus. 3.8.2 c.a.n.

Simonides represents a more archaic view of commemoration that privileges the hero as an individual, distinct from the collective force. This stands in marked contrast to the *kleos* that Simonides shapes for his subjects, which consists just in their anonymity and collectivity. I do not claim that it was Simonides' intention to distinguish himself in this way, but only that the transmission of his name along with his epigrams, in contrast to the norms of the genre, illustrates the perpetuation of his individual *kleos*. The final part of my argument is that this group of epigrams illustrates not only the creation of a more democratic *ethos* than the genre of epigram had conveyed before, but can still be seen as a locus of archaic ideals in the apportionment of *kleos* to an individual. Although Simonidean epigrams on the Persian Wars emphasize the triumph and subsequent *kleos* of the collective, a different effect is visible with the perpetuation of Simonides', or the Simonidean persona's, fame as a poet. While his poems privilege the collective, Simonides the individual (or at least, the individual name) is remembered and revered as the poet of the Persian Wars. The *kleos* of a poet, then, is something quite different from that of a soldier. The latter may not be commemorated as an individual (as Pausanias' attempt shows), but the former is lauded as an individual, and it is his name that is transmitted over and above the names of the individual soldiers whom his poems commemorate.

The *kleos* of an individual poet, then, can exist without conflict in the Greek mind alongside the *kleos* of the collective. My interpretation of Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars not only reveals the democratic *ethos* therein, but, as a product of this interpretation, also demonstrates the co-existence of another, older ideology that exists in

apparent harmony with a newer concept that privileges the collective over the individual. The convergence of these conflicting ideals that the epigrams manifest alludes to the pivotal aspect of the Persian Wars, that is, as the event that distinguishes the archaic period from the classical. My study helps to show why the Persian Wars may be retrospectively posited as the turning point between archaic and classical periods, precisely because the commemoration of this event and its consequences involves elements that both look forward and backward. The panhellenic scale of the Persian Wars and the masses of dead that resulted from them necessitated that Simonides, or the Simonidean persona, depart from the norms of epigrammatic language in his commemorations of the fallen. In so doing, Simonides distinguishes himself from other poets of the genre, but more importantly, distinguishes himself in these epigrams because of the democratic *ethos* that characterizes these works. Two distinct types of *kleos* thus emerge, one for the individual poetic persona and one for the collective, anonymous war dead.

Bibliography

- Arrington, Nathan T. "Topographic Semantics: The Location of the Athenian Public Cemetery and Its Significance for the Nascent Democracy", *Hesperia* (2010) 499-539.
- Baumbach, Manuel, Petrovic, Andrej, and Ivana Petrovic, eds. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*. Cambridge: 2010.
- Bakker, Egbert, De Jong, Irene, and Hans Van Wees, eds. *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: 2002.
- Bing, Peter. *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen: 1988.
- Boedeker, Deborah and David Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford: 2001.
- Boedeker, Deborah. "Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea" in Boedeker and Sider (2001), 120-135.
- Boegehold, Alan. 'The Salamis epigram.' *GRBS* (1965) 6: 179-86.
- Bruss, Jon Steffen. *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram*. Hellenistica Groningana: 2005.
- "Ecphrasis in fits and starts? Down to 300 BC" in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010) 385-404.
- Campbell, David A. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Bristol: 1982.
- Clairmont, Chrostpher. *Gravestone and Epigram. Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*. Mainz: 1970.
- Day, Joseph. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication*. Cambridge: 2010.
- "Rituals in Stone. Early Greek epigrams and monuments." *JHS* 109 (1989): 16-28.
- "Interactive offerings. Early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual". *HSPH* 96 (1994): 37-74.

- Goldhill, Simon and Robin Osborne, eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge: 1994.
- Gutzwiller, Kathryn. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. California: 1998.
- Hansen, P.A. *Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum VIII-V A. CHR. N.* Berlin and New York: 1983.
- Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculi IV A. CHR. N.* Berlin and New York: 1989.
- Higbie, Carolyn. "Epigrams on the Persian Wars: monuments, memory and politics" in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010) 183-201.
- Jacoby, F. "Some Athenian epigrams from the Persian Wars," *Hesperia* (1945) 14: 157-211.
- Keesling, Catherine M. "The Callimachus monument on the Athenian Acropolis" in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010) 100-130.
- Kurtz, Donna C. and John Boardman, eds. *Greek Burial Customs*. Cornell: 1971.
- Loraux, Nicole. *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. Alan Sheridan. Cambridge: 1986.
- Luraghi, Nino, ed. *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford: 2007.
- Meiggs, Russell and David Lewis, eds. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, revised ed. Oxford: 1969.
- Molyneux, John H. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Bolchazy-Carducci: 1992.
- Obbink, Dirk. 'The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides' in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 65-86.
- Osborne, Robin. 'Archaic Greek History' in Bakker, de Jong, and Van Wees (2002): 497-520.
- Page, D. L. ed. *Further Greek Epigrams. Epigrams before AD 50 from the Greek Anthology and other Sources not included in 'Hellenistic Epigrams' or 'The Garland of Philip*. Cambridge: 1981
- .
ed. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: 1975.

- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: 1995.
- Stehle, Eva. 'A Bard of the Iron Age and His Auxiliary Muse' in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 106-120.
- Svenbro, J. *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd. Ithaca: 1993.
- Thomas, Rosalind. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: 2007.
- Herodotus in Context: ethnography, science, and the art of persuasion*. Cambridge: 2000.
- Tueller, Michael A. "The passer-by in archaic and classical epigram" in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010) 42-60.
- Vestheim, Gjert. "Voice in sepulchral epigrams" in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010) 61-78.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. "Classical epigrams and epitaphs." *JHS* (1933) 53: 71-104.